

SAGA OF SATYAGRAHA

R. R. DIWAKAR

1969

GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION NEW DELHI
BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN BOMBAY

ject for study. Shri R.R. Diwakar has rendered a valuable service in writing a sort of a text-book on the subject. He has dealt with it as one who has not only studied books but who has also taken his course of practical training in a laboratory. The main book of Shri Diwakar has a Preface¹ written by Shri Kishorlal G. Mashruwala who is one of the acutest students of the Gandhian philosophy and whose close association with Gandhiji gives his words an authority which may not be disregarded. It is hoped the book will be read not only by the curious but also by serious students who wish to understand and mould themselves in the Gandhian way of life.

Sadaqat Ashram
3 January 1946

RAJENDRA PRASAD

1. Now published as Appendix 1.

INTRODUCTION

Satyāgraha—Its Technique and History was the name of the first edition of this book. It was published in 1946 and it has been out of print for some years. It has been in demand from several quarters, especially from scholars and students who want to study satyāgraha both as a way of life and as a science and art and a method which can serve as a powerful instrument of social change.

An American version of it was prepared by Dr Clifford Manshardt, who was for some time Cultural Attache to the American Embassy in India. This version had an additional title, namely 'The Power of Truth' and was published in the Humanist Library series by Henry Regnery of Illinois. When I was in the United States in 1960, I was told that the American version was being used as one of the texts for cultural studies of India. In fact, Dr Rajendra Prasad in his Foreword to the first Indian edition says that the book might well serve as a text-book on satyāgraha.

During my itinerary of the U.S.A. in 1960, I visited Atlanta, Georgia, and attended a conference of civil resisters who were fighting for the rights of Negroes. About three hundred attended, sixty of whom had undergone imprisonment and other penalties. Dr Martin Luther King Jr, who had earlier spent a month in India as the guest of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi, addressed the meeting. He and his wife invited me to their house and I spent some time with them. Dr King told me then that my book in its American version had helped him to understand some of the deeper and detailed aspects of satyāgraha.

Since the book had been out of print for some time and there was a persistent demand for it, the Publications Committee of the Gandhi Peace Foundation thought that a new edition was called for. The Committee had a special Gandhi Centenary programme of bringing out new editions of some of the books on Gandhi which deserved reprinting and thought that this book ought to be among them.

I too had been thinking of a new edition but I felt that I should thoroughly revise the first edition and try to bring it up to date. I have accordingly added some chapters to highlight the significance

CONTENTS

| | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| CHAPTER 1. | Satyāgraha—Its Meaning | ... | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2. | Antecedents of Satyāgraha | ... | 6 |
| CHAPTER 3. | Satyāgraha is Born | ... | 11 |
| CHAPTER 4. | Satyāgraha—Its Evolution | ... | 15 |
| CHAPTER 5. | Truth is the Foundation | ... | 18 |
| CHAPTER 6. | Truth and Nonviolence | ... | 21 |
| CHAPTER 7. | Ahimsā—Love | ... | 32 |
| CHAPTER 8. | Principles of Satyāgraha | ... | 38 |
| CHAPTER 9. | Satyāgraha—Its Scope | ... | 44 |
| CHAPTER 10. | Satyāgraha—A Way of Life | ... | 48 |
| CHAPTER 11. | Satyāgraha—A Tool for Social Change | ... | 52 |
| CHAPTER 12. | Satyāgraha by the Masses | ... | 58 |
| CHAPTER 13. | Moral Equivalent for War | ... | 64 |
| CHAPTER 14. | Towards No-war | ... | 71 |
| CHAPTER 15. | Satyāgraha—Its Future | ... | 80 |
| CHAPTER 16. | Satyāgraha and Pacifism | ... | 85 |
| CHAPTER 17. | Organization and Training | ... | 89 |
| CHAPTER 18. | Discipline for Satyāgraha | ... | 97 |
| CHAPTER 19. | Satyāgraha—Its Technique | ... | 101 |
| CHAPTER 20. | Some Questions | ... | 109 |
| CHAPTER 21. | Satyāgraha—Individual and Domestic | ... | 115 |
| CHAPTER 22. | Satyāgraha Campaigns by Gandhi | ... | 118 |
| CHAPTER 23. | Satyāgraha by Others | ... | 138 |
| CHAPTER 24. | History as Witness | ... | 150 |
| CHAPTER 25. | Rowlatt Act Satyāgraha | ... | 157 |
| CHAPTER 26. | Nonviolent Non-Cooperation | ... | 161 |
| CHAPTER 27. | Civil Disobedience for Svarāj | ... | 167 |
| CHAPTER 28. | Civil Disobedience Again | ... | 174 |
| CHAPTER 29. | Anti-War Satyāgraha | ... | 179 |
| CHAPTER 30. | 'Quit India' Movement | ... | 183 |
| APPENDIX 1. | Observations by Mashruwala | ... | 186 |
| APPENDIX 2. | Satyāgraha by the Pathans | ... | 199 |
| APPENDIX 3. | Satyāgraha and the Negroes | ... | 211 |
| APPENDIX 4. | Dr Martin Luther King Jr | ... | 215 |

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| APPENDIX 5. | Vows of Satyāgraha Āśram (Sabarmati) | ... | 225 |
| APPENDIX 6. | Rules for a Satyāgrahi | ... | 228 |
| APPENDIX 7. | Some Pledges | ... | 231 |
| APPENDIX 8. | The Constructive Programme | ... | 234 |
| GLOSSARY | | ... | 235 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | | ... | 238 |
| INDEX | | ... | 242 |

SATYĀGRAHA—ITS MEANING

The word satyāgraha is Sanskrit in origin. It is a compound word formed of satya and āgraha. Satya means truth and āgraha means holding fast, adherence, insistence. Thus the compound word means clinging to truth, holding fast to truth, insistence on truth, or firm adherence to truth come what may.

Satya itself is derived from sat, which means being, that which exists. Satya means that which is in accordance with sat or being, that is, truth. Thus that which is in accordance with what exists, correct knowledge of things as they are, is truth. Action according to truth, or right action, has a special word for it in the Vedas. It is ṛta. (From ṛta is derived anṛta, i.e., what is not right, a lie.) Satya is knowledge of truth and ṛta is action according to truth. The Vedic ṛsis insist that satya and ṛta must go together; sometimes the words are used alternately.

We shall later discuss the exact meaning of truth, as also its implications. First we shall go into the origin of the compound word 'satyāgraha', which is very interesting. In 1906 Gandhi organized the Indians in South Africa and led a new kind of resistance movement against the unjust laws under which they were then suffering. This movement was called in the beginning 'Passive Resistance'. Gandhi himself used this term in the early stages, but later he 'felt ashamed' of using an English word which could not be easily understood and used as current coin by the Indian people. What was more important, he felt that the movement he had started was essentially different from what was ordinarily known as 'passive resistance'. This term is still current, and the immediate outward form of the new movement adopted by Indians in South Africa was no doubt something like that of passive resistance, which is distinguished from active or violent armed resistance. But there the resemblance ends. The approach, the underlying philosophy, and the technique of the new movement were all different from those of simple passive resistance. Gandhi felt the need for an appropriate word for the new kind of

resistance and as nothing suggested itself to him, he announced a prize in his weekly, *Indian Opinion*, to any reader suggesting one. Perhaps the best among the many entries that were submitted was the word 'sadāgraha' suggested by Maganlal Gandhi, meaning 'firmness in a good cause' or 'adherence to a good cause'. Bearing in mind the difference between 'sat' and 'satya' mentioned above, Gandhi modified Shri Maganlal's suggested word to 'satyāgraha', to connote the full meaning which he wished to express, namely, 'truth-force' or the power of truth, force born of truth and love or nonviolence. For Gandhi, truth and nonviolence or love have always clung together.

Truth and truthful action are given the highest place in all religions and so in Hinduism too. The unswerving pursuit of satya or truth is quite a familiar theme in Sanskrit and other Indian literatures. But the word 'satyāgraha' does not seem to have been used anywhere so far. The words 'satyavrata' (one whose rule of life is truth), 'satyadhṛti' (holding truth firmly), 'satyaniṣṭha' (absolutely loyal to truth), 'satyavat' (one who is truthful), and 'satyasamḍha' (wedded to truth), occur often enough with reference to great characters like Hariścandra, Rāma, Bhīṣma, Dharmarāja and others. 'Satyāgraha' stands for a significant and a new connotation altogether.

Since this new term was deliberately substituted for 'passive resistance', it is necessary to state the difference between the two. Passive resistance, as commonly understood in the West in its historical setting and as understood by us now, is a weapon of the weak, of the unarmed and helpless. It does not eschew violence as a matter of principle but only because of lack of the means of violence, or out of sheer expediency. It would use arms if and when they are available or when on account of their use there is a reasonable chance of success. Passive resistance may even be preparatory to or go hand in hand with armed resistance. The underlying object is to harass the opponent and thus force him into the desired course of action. Love has no place in it. It cannot be used against our nearest and dearest because it involves hatred and distrust. There is no place for service of the people or constructive activity in it. It cannot become a philosophy of life.

In Gandhi's mind the distinction between passive resistance and his own method which he later called 'satyāgraha' was quite clear since the earliest days, but he continued to use the term 'passive resistance' till a mass movement based on the new technique made it necessary to use a new and Indian name.

Joseph Doke, one of the earliest of Gandhi's biographers, once asked him how he got the idea of nonviolent resistance. Gandhi said: 'I remember how one verse of a Gujarati poem (by Shamal Bhat), which as a child I learnt at school, clung to me. In substance it was this: "If a man gives you a drink of water and you give him a drink in return, that is nothing. Real beauty consists in doing good against evil." As a child this verse had a powerful influence over me, and I tried to carry it into practice. Then came the 'Sermon on the Mount'.

'But surely,' asked Mr Doke, 'the *Bhagavadgītā* came first?'

'No,' Gandhi replied, 'Of course, I knew the *Bhagavadgītā* in Sanskrit tolerably well, but I had not made its teaching in that particular a study. It was the New Testament which really awakened me to the rightness and value of "passive resistance". When I read in the "Sermon on the Mount" such passages as "Resist not him that is evil but whoever smiteth thee on thy cheek turn to him the other also", and "Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven". I was simply overjoyed when I found my own opinion confirmed where I least expected it. The *Bhagavadgītā* deepened the impression, and Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* gave it a permanent form'.

In the beginning of the movement, some sympathetic Europeans of Germistone, a suburb of Johannesburg, expressed their desire to hear Gandhi. A meeting was arranged. By way of introducing the speaker and his movement, one Mr Hosken observed: 'The Transvaal Indians had recourse to passive resistance when all other means of securing redress proved to be of no avail. They do not enjoy the franchise. Numerically they have taken to passive resistance, which is a weapon of the weak.' These observations took Gandhi by surprise. In contradicting Mr Hosken, Gandhi defined his passive resistance as 'soul-force'. He told the audience that brute-force had no place at all in this programme even if there was a possibility of using it; that if Indians had arms and franchise he would have advised them to use soul-force only. In planning satyāgraha in South Africa, Gandhi asserts, even the slightest thought about the use of physical force did not touch him at any time or at any stage.

Words have a life of their own. Often enough they grow in depth and power with the march of events, like streams that have but an humble origin. Gandhi says that at the time of the adoption of

CHAPTER 2

ANTECEDENTS OF SATYĀGRAHA

Before we proceed to describe satyāgraha as a method of resisting evil and as a whole philosophy of life; let us go into its antecedents in legend and history. Two instances out of Indian mythology which strongly influenced Gandhi in his early days come to our mind: the story of Prahlāda and the drama of Hariścandra. He has mentioned Prahlāda in his speeches very often and he has written in his autobiography that he was profoundly influenced by the drama of 'Hariścandra'.

Prahlāda was a young boy devoted to God, but his father was an atheist. He admonished the child not to take the name of God, as to him none existed. But the boy persisted and the father began to persecute him. Beatings, torture, and many other cruel things followed, all of which the boy suffered out of his firm conviction about the existence of God. The more he was persecuted the more he stuck to his convictions, and he would always pray to God to convince his father of His existence. The story goes that finally when the cup was full, God appeared and began the well-deserved chastisement of the father, but that the child intervened and saved the father's soul.

The story of Hariścandra is still more interesting. He was a great king, renowned for his unflinching adherence to truth. Viśvāmitra, a well-known sage, wanted to test the king. He caused the king to dream that he had gifted away his kingdom to Viśvāmitra. Next day while the king was narrating his dream to his people, lo, there was Viśvāmitra, come to claim the kingdom. The king was so truthful that he gave away the kingdom and made ready to walk out with his wife and child with nothing except the clothes they wore. But that was only the beginning. The sage demanded dakṣiṇā in addition without which no gift is complete. The king had now nothing except himself, his wife, and his son. He asked his wife to take employment as a maid-servant in Kashi which was outside his former kingdom, and himself became a bondsman. That was how the

dakṣiṇā was paid. Then began trials and tribulations which have hardly a parallel even in legend. The story proceeds to relate many pathetic incidents which bring out the cheerful sufferings of the royal family and the king's utter adherence to his pledged word. The climax was reached when the royal bondsman was charged by his master to execute for some fault the queen now turned maid-servant—Viśvāmitra in his zeal to test the king had managed to bring about even such a situation. The king did not fail. Hariścandra began to do his duty as a bondsman, raised a sword over the head of his queen to strike her down. Viśvāmitra then melted. Staying the hand of the king, he said: 'O king, there is none so great as you in all three worlds. You are the most truthful of all human beings.' After seeing the drama, Gandhi felt: 'Why should not all be truthful like Hariścandra?'

Coming to historical times, we have the great figures of Buddha and Mahāvīra who preached nonviolence, ahimsā, as a creed. The basic tenet of both Jainism and Buddhism is ahimsā paramo dharmaḥ, ahimsā, non-injury, is the greatest religion or the greatest duty. Along with and in addition to this Hinduism says, satyānnāsti paro dharmaḥ, there is no religion or duty greater than truth. Thus truth and nonviolence are the corner-stones of Hinduism. Once when Gandhi was asked why he emphasized truth more than love or non-violence, he replied that truth is greater than all, it includes and transcends everything. Islam also means peace. It is the religion of peace for all. Then we have Jesus of Nazareth. We have Socrates. We hear the names of the Sufi saints, Hafiz and Sarmad. We have Nandanār, Tukārām, Kanakadās and Eknāth. In each one's life we have incidents that testify to their having acted as satyāgrahīs in their individual capacity. With no ill-will towards his persecutors, Socrates drank the hemlock. Tukārām was persecuted in many ways by his compeers but he never so much as cursed them. Eknāth was on one occasion spat upon twenty times and each time he calmly returned to the river to wash off the pollution but never uttered a single harsh word. The twenty-first time he was let alone! We have the examples of the so-called untouchable saints who would not be allowed to come near the deity of their devotion and who performed a sort of sitting satyāgraha till the Lord Himself stepped out or turned his face to look on his devotee! We thus have the 'Kanakana khinḍī' (Aperture of Kanaka) at the Udupi temple and the Chokha Mela Steps at the Pandharpur temple. The crucifixion of Christ is a supreme

instance of martyrdom in the cause of truth. Not all rulers are quite as openly flippant about truth as was Pontius Pilate, the Roman consul, who jestingly asked Jesus: 'What is truth?' and did not even wait for an answer. More often they have pretended to be themselves the exponents and high priests of truth! In the life of Jesus we see the principles of satyāgraha definitely taking shape. The statements like 'Resist not evil' and others in the 'Sermon on the Mount' are expressions which embody the way of life indicated by satyāgraha. But Buddha and Christ applied the principles of nonviolence in their own lives and exhorted the people to act accordingly. They, however, never employed this method for solving the social and political problems of whole communities of men; their interest was mainly religious. In fact, in the secular field, when questioned if taxes should be paid, Christ is known to have advised: 'Render unto Caesar Caesar's coin.'

Perhaps the most direct example of an active, peaceful resistance to injustice nearest to us in history is that of Henry David Thoreau who refused to pay what to him appeared an iniquitous tax and preferred to go to jail on the issue.

One of the greatest personalities that influenced Gandhi was Count Leo Tolstoy. Born in a princely family, Tolstoy, towards the close of his life, left wife and home and retired to live alone and practise what he believed to be the most essential principles of Christianity, principles which he has explained in his *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. He was a conscientious pacifist and in his retirement to solitude practised the vows of poverty and chastity (brahmacarya). In fact, Gandhi founded in South Africa together with some friends a colony which he called the 'Tolstoy Farm' where the members lived as a single brotherhood. Tolstoy's influence on Gandhi's life has been very great indeed. He was in constant communication with that Russian sage while he was living.

Practically since immemorial times India has known in a semi-natal form two ways of aggressive (as opposed to what is known in the West as 'passive') but entirely peaceful resistance. One is 'dharnā' which really means (from *dhṛ* 'to hold') holding out. This is resorted to by individuals or small groups, never by large masses. This is usually a method which creditors adopt when the debtors say they owe nothing or repudiate the debt. The creditor wants to prove by fasting at the door of the debtor that the debt is real. He is willing to suffer without any ill-will against the debtor. The same method

is also adopted among near relations for enforcing any demands which they believe to be just but which they have failed to secure in any other way.

Reverend Doke writes: 'The idea of passive resistance as a means of opposing evil is inherent in Indian philosophy. In old times, it was called "to sit dharnā". Sometimes a whole community would adopt this method towards their prince. It has been so in the history of Porbandar; then trade was dislocated and force proved helpless before the might of passive resistance. Bishop Heber wrote of it many years ago in his journal: "To sit dharnā or mourning, is to remain motionless in that posture, without food, and exposed to the weather, till the person against whom it is employed consents to the request offered, and the Hindus believed that whosoever dies under this process becomes a tormenting spirit to haunt and afflict his inflexible antagonist".

The other is 'hartāl', or strike or stoppage of work. It is very common to resort to 'hartāl' whenever there is any national mourning or public dissatisfaction. It is often used as a mark of protest or demonstration to show that a particular measure or step taken by a king or prince is detestable. It is more for drawing the attention of the prince than for holding up the whole business of state. It is a short-duration strike. There are no recorded instances in Indian history of long-drawn strikes of the nature of the modern 'general strike'.

There was, however, a third method which was sometimes used to escape the tyranny of a prince. It was called *deśatyāga* or leaving the land with all one's belongings. In fact, in ancient India it was considered the duty of a wise man to undertake *deśatyāga* when all methods of weaning a king from bad ways had failed. Rather than supporting such a king by paying him taxes etc., it was considered one's duty to abandon the kingdom, and leave the king 'to stew in his own juice of loneliness' so to say.

Needless to say, most of these are instances of passive non-resistance in self-defence as a means of getting individual wrongs righted by peaceful means. The saints led spiritual lives and were indifferent to worldly goods. Most of them avoided the other affairs of life. When persecuted they fell back on their own way of resisting. With rare exceptions, such as that of Socrates, their chief concern was the extra-mundane life and that too of the individual, not of the group or community.

There are, of course, quite a number of examples where large communities offered what to the West is known as passive resistance. The reader will find in later chapters instances of passive resistance undertaken in various lands and by different peoples. The great difference between these attempts of peaceful resistance and satyāgraha was that they did not eschew violence as a matter of principle but only refrained from violence for reasons of expediency.

Labour strikes have sometimes been mistakenly cited as examples of satyāgraha, but except that they are very often peaceful, there is very little that is common between the two forms of resistance. The strike is essentially a weapon of economic coercion where either party wants to bring its opponents to their knees by applying economic pressure even to the extent of producing, as among the ranks of the labourers, starvation and misery. The strike, therefore, has to be ruled out as an illusion of real satyāgraha, both in its object and its means.

Thus the most perfect examples of satyāgraha as an individual's means of fighting oppression still remain the examples of Prahlāda, whose story has so greatly influenced Gandhi, and of Socrates who maintained sentiments of charity and goodwill towards his persecutors, and who bravely suffered the ultimate penalty for what he considered his duty. Of communities or groups employing the method of satyāgraha in Gandhi's own sense there are none, except perhaps the examples of dharnā and hartāl in India. In Mulford Q. Sibley's *The Quiet Battle* there are many examples which can be said to bear a great similarity to satyāgraha. But even these were never developed as a scientific method of meeting injustice and persecution or other evils of a similar nature.

CHAPTER 3

SATYĀGRAHA IS BORN

We have read in the last chapter the antecedents of satyāgraha. We will now proceed to show how Gandhi came to adapt a nebulous, semi-religious doctrine to the solution of the problems of day-to-day life and thus gave to humanity a new weapon to fight evil and injustice nonviolently and at the same time evolved a whole philosophy of life.

Since quite early in life Gandhi had been a consistent opponent of every form of injustice, oppression and falsehood. A passion for truth had been innate in him. This saved him from many a pitfall, and led him to the way of satyāgraha. He writes: 'One thing took deep root in me, the conviction that morality is the basis of things and that truth is the substance of morality. Thus truth became my sole objective.' He discovered quite early that truth did not admit of violence. The opponent must be weaned by sympathy and patience, and patience means self-suffering.

It was his love of truth in boyhood that saved him from meat-eating, made him confess to his father when he stole something from his brother, saved him from wine and women in England. His pledged word was the truth he followed; a vow for him had the value of a categorical imperative, a command absolute about which no prevarication, no compromise could be allowed. And his iron will sustained him unflinchingly through the pursuit of every vow or the fulfilment of every pledged word.

After he had trained himself to pursue truth and nonviolence, and learned to practise in his daily life the teachings of saints and seers, to practise ahimsā in thought, word and deed, incidents occurred which put to the test his allegiance to all those principles, and he came out triumphant and with increased moral stature. All his personal experiences in South Africa, at Mauritzburg, Pardeburg, Johannesburg, Pretoria and Durban evolved him along the line of satyāgraha and fitted him to lead the mass movement in that land. The incident at Pardeburg in 1893 is worth studying. It contained all the elements of future satyāgraha. On that occasion Gandhi had to travel in a coach. He had bought a first class ticket and yet was

made to sit outside the coach by the side of the coachman. He had in fact not only a right to sit where he was sitting but even to sit inside the coach. So truth was on his side. The coach-guard nevertheless asked him to get off the seat and sit at his feet. Gandhi respectfully refused. Thereupon the guard began to belabour him. Gandhi too could have struck him a blow or two. But no. His method of resistance was different. He did not even abuse him, nor did he wish him ill. But he stuck on to his seat. He suffered at the hands of an erring brother without retaliation or ill-will. Then the passengers intervened and the beating stopped. At the next stop he could have taken legal proceedings against the guard. But that idea did not even touch him. He acted like a true satyāgrahī. He had right and truth on his side. He was ready to suffer to the end and to convert the opponent rather than inflict suffering on him. He wanted to conquer his anger by goodwill. He refused even mentally to wish ill of him and would not retaliate even when he had the opportunity and the strength.

When in 1896 he returned to South Africa from India, there was a threatening mob of Europeans on the wharf waiting to lynch him. The captain of the ship in which Gandhi was sailing asked him: 'What about your nonviolence?' Gandhi replied readily: 'I hope God will give the courage and the sense to forgive them and to refrain from bringing them to the law. I have no anger against them. I am only sorry for their narrowness.'

And so he went on gradually preparing himself for the mass struggle in South Africa in 1906. The South African satyagraha was quite in consonance with Gandhi's personal ideal of the pursuit of truth through love. In fact it was an extension of that ideal to the social and political fields. It was the application of the law of domestic life—the law of love, love for all—to the whole of humanity which Gandhi had come to regard even as his own family—*vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*.

In the domestic circle each is bound to the others by ties of natural affection, by love through constant association. Hate, destruction and fear have no place in the family. Hate is like a hurricane that destroys indiscriminately. It is a blind force, a fire ablaze that knows no distinction. Love, mutual affection and regard are the basis of family life. And love means looking upon others as oneself. One loves oneself most and if one looks upon everyone else as one

is nothing if it does not express itself in concrete acts of service. It must act and act thus if it is to fulfil itself. The consummation of love is in complete surrender through service and sacrifice for the loved one. The extension of this principle of an ideal family life to all human relations constitutes the way of love.

Gandhi said that it was in his family life that he learnt the lesson of satyāgraha. In fact, he confessed that perhaps his most direct teacher in satyāgraha, apart from the saints and prophets of antiquity, and men like Tolstoy and Thoreau, was his wife Kasturba. Gandhi says : 'I learnt the lesson of nonviolence (satyāgraha) from my wife. I tried to bend her to my will. Her determined resistance to my will on the one hand, and her quiet submission to the suffering my stupidity involved on the other, ultimately made me ashamed of myself and cured me of my stupidity in thinking that I was born to rule over her; and in the end she became my teacher in nonviolence. And what I did in South Africa was but an extension of the rule of satyāgraha she unwittingly practised in her own person.'

The decision to resort to satyāgraha in South Africa came to Gandhi suddenly. In his autobiography he says that self-purification in the form of brahmacharya was preparing him for it, that within about a month after his return to Phoenix Park from Johannesburg the foundation of satyāgraha was laid after the vow of brahmacharya had been taken in Phoenix. 'As though unknown to me the vow of brahmacharya has been preparing me for satyāgraha.' He adds: 'Satyāgraha was not a preconceived plan. It came on spontaneously without my having willed it.'

To a question asked by Reverend Doke as to how he began the satyāgraha movement among his people, Gandhi said: 'Well, some years ago, when I began to take active part in the public life of Natal, the adoption of this method occurred to me as the best course, should petitions fail. But, in the then unorganized condition of our Indian Community, the attempt seemed useless. Here, however, in Johannesburg, when the Asiatic Registration Act was introduced the Indian Community was so deeply stirred, and so knit together in a common to resist it, that the moment seemed opportune. Some action they would take; it seemed to be the best for the colony, and altogether right, that their action should not take a riotous form, but that of passive resistance. They had no vote in Parliament, no hope of obtaining redress, no one would listen to their complaints. The Christian Churches were indifferent. So I proposed this pathway of suffering

14 SAGA OF ŚATYAGRAHA

and after much discussion it was adopted.' This description of the origin of the South African satyāgraha is very important historically since it is the oldest and the most authentic, and it is recorded by the very author of the movement soon after it started.

The reader is referred to a later chapter for a brief account of the South African struggle. It is the most important struggle in the history of satyāgraha since it is the first of its kind. And yet even in the first struggle Gandhi conducted, he had full faith in the weapon and was quite confident of the result. In his speech on 11 September 1906 he said: 'But I can boldly declare, and with certainty, that so long as there are even a handful of men true to their pledge there can be only one end to the struggle and that is victory.' In his *Satyāgraha in South Africa* Gandhi writes: 'This was the genesis of the movement which came to be known as satyāgraha.'

SATYĀGRAHA—ITS EVOLUTION

Tracing briefly the progress of humanity towards nonviolence Gandhi remarks: 'If we turn our eyes to the time of which history has any record down to our own time, we shall find that man has been steadily progressing towards ahimsā. Our remote ancestors were cannibals. Then came a time when they were fed up with cannibalism and they began to live on the chase. Next came a stage when man was ashamed of leading the life of a wandering hunter. He, therefore, took to agriculture and depended principally on mother earth for his food. Thus from being a nomad he settled down to civilised stable life, founded villages and towns, and from a member of a family he became a member of a community and a nation. All these are signs of progressive ahimsā and diminishing himsā. Had it been otherwise, the human species should have been extinct by now, even as many of the lower species have disappeared.'

It is not along the lines of violence or destruction that humanity has progressed. It is by shunning and avoiding them that it has today reached a certain stage of civilization. Ordered society presupposes security, cooperation, mutual aid. These are impossible without nonviolence. There have been bloody wars and it seems unfortunately inevitable that there still will be many. But humanity has advanced in spite of them and not on account of them. Even those few who advocate war do so on account of their mistaken idea that it promotes certain heroic virtues. Others go to war apologetically, saying that it is a necessary evil. They would be the first to abandon that path if they were convinced of the effectiveness of the nonviolent method.

The first unit of human grouping must have been naturally the family and that is based on nonviolence, on love, on mutual affection and respect. The ideals governing a family too have evolved from autocracy, based on physical might, to perfect equality, based on justice and mutual needs. They thus point out the evolution from violence to nonviolence and love. The institution of law and justice, the formation of society, our treatment of the insane and the criminal, show signs of the growing recognition of the law of nonviolence and

love. We no longer treat our criminals with hatred or contempt. We no longer ridicule our insane. We have come to recognize that a humane treatment, full of the milk of human kindness, alone will cure the madman and the criminal. Our treatment of children too has undergone profound changes. All these changes clearly indicate that we are evolving along the path of nonviolence and love and we are definitely eschewing the path of violence, hatred and coercion.

It is time for us to explore the possibilities of that promising path in our economic, social and political relations, between nation and nation and between groups of nations as well. If we believe in right and reason and justice, there is no other way. Might is not right. It is up to all who feel that right ought to succeed, to organize right in such a way as to neutralize all blind might. If might really is right, then goodbye to the moral law, which is based on right, reason, justice, humanity and other noble considerations. They then prove to be a mirage or poetic fancy.

Satyāgraha does not despair at any temporary triumph of might. It never concedes the view that might is right. It is confident that human evolution is based on the law of love and nonviolence, that right must succeed not by superior might but by its own strength and by its weapon of love and suffering. It is evident that evolution is leading humanity to peace and happiness. Being constructive in its content, satyāgraha always strives at removing the obstructions to human progress, namely, ignorance, sloth, cowardice, possessive instincts, tendency to aggression and exploitation, ambition, lust, love of power and so on. Thus satyāgraha works on as a part and parcel of the evolutionary urge that is carrying humanity towards greater harmony, better peace and nobler happiness.

No good ever came out of giving tit for tat or returning evil for evil. It only perpetuates the reign of violence. Violence used in any shape or form, with whatever justification, only recoils upon and brutalises man. It brutalises him that uses it and him against whom it is used—if the latter is not armed with a nonviolent attitude. If we kill our violent enemy by violence we at the same time give a fresh lease of life to violence. There never yet has been violence unattended by hatred and a desire for revenge. The reaction to violence is always harmful. The opponent has his own point of view, which is likely to be hardened if violence and suffering are inflicted; they nourish a feeling for retaliation. Violence never once purified its victim: it

than the disease. Inflicted suffering gives rise to fear and all its attendant evils—cowardice, anger, hatred. The only sure way of laying violence to rest is to overcome evil by good, hatred by love, anger by calmness, untruth by truth, and *himsā* by *ahimsā*. There is no other way of purging the world of its evil. The *satyāgrahī* first banishes evil and hatred from his own mind and thus clears the deck for a battle of which the end is to drown all violence by adopting nonviolence and self-suffering as the means.

It is bad tactics, worse strategy, confused planning to try to remove dirt by dirt, to eliminate violence by violence, to try to banish fear by infliction of greater fear. History has proved the truth of this time and again. Fear is at best a negative sentiment and is easily overpowered by the much more positive feeling of hatred, by the transcending thirst for vengeance. You cannot wage war to end war. Some time humanity has got to get out of the vicious circle of violence and counter-violence, and *satyāgraha* seems the only way.

CHAPTER 5

TRUTH IS THE FOUNDATION

For a satyāgrahī, truth is the one supreme end and nonviolence or love the only means to attain it. They are the obverse and reverse of the same coin. If at any time doubt arises as to which of them is the more important or primary, unquestionably 'truth precedes'. But if anyone is confused about truth any day, let him follow nonviolence, the way of love, the path of self-suffering, and it needs must lead him to truth.

What is this truth? Let us try to see. When I say I am telling the truth, what do I mean? I mean that my speech accords with the fact, as I have perceived it. When a friend who listens to me says, 'Yes, it is the truth,' he means that what I said was according to the fact as he too perceived it. When many people say that what I say is true, it means that they all perceive the fact as I do. Our perceptions regarding a particular thing are alike, our experience about it similar. This accordance of fact, perception or experience, and expression is truthfulness or the quality of being true. If I act according to the truth I perceive, I am said to be truthful in action. Thus, fact, its perception as it is, expression of that perception as experienced, and action in consonance with that perception completes the chain of truthfulness in its entirety. But it may be that I perceive a fact but do not express it. I may keep the perception to myself. Still I have perceived the truth because I have perceived a fact as it is, as it exists in its natural form. There I am truthful in thought only. I may perceive a fact as it is, express my perception, and still I may not act accordingly. There I am truthful in thought and speech but not in action. But when I perceive a fact as it is, express my perception according to the fact, and act according to my perception, I may be said to have perceived, expressed and acted according to truth. I am truthful throughout.

Sometimes it may happen that there is no necessity to express a truth nor an obligation to act. There it may suffice to perceive a truth and rest at that. For instance, suppose I look at a beautiful dawn. I simply perceive the beauty, or express it, if I feel like it, to my friend. There is no obligation on me to act on the perception

of this truth of nature. But if, under particular circumstances, there is an obligation on me to act and if I fail to do so, I am certainly culpable for failing in my duty. Let me take an example.

We all hold that man-slaughter is an evil which everyone ought to prevent. This means that we have perceived that murder is an evil. Then if a murder is about to be perpetrated in my presence, it becomes my duty to prevent it even at the risk of my life. I must also proclaim the intentions of the murderer to those whose duty it is to keep law and order in society. If I do neither, I am neither speaking the truth nor acting the truth. I am guilty of gross failure of duty. Therefore, knowing the truth is not sufficient. Perception and knowledge have their fulfilment in right or truthful speech and right or truthful action. Right perception or true knowledge must not end in sterile contemplation or sweet peroration, but in right action where action is called for. Life is action. Right action, action according to truth, is the test of all that we claim to be. If we fail there, we fail in everything. We fail in the very consummation of life and its purpose.

Now, it may be that I am not able to perceive a fact as it is. My perception is likely to be defective. In such a case, all I can do is to be as careful, as dispassionate and objective, and as disinterested as possible, and try my best to purify and correct the means of perception. I can take another precaution. Every time I have an occasion to perceive a fact, I may test the perception again and again righteously, till I feel that, to the best of my ability, I have seen the truth and nothing but the truth. It may also happen that while my perception of fact is tolerably truthful, my expression is not faithful. There again vigilance in the choice of correct words and expression is absolutely necessary. Then again while I am right in perception and expression, I may fail in action. There too I must try my best to be a man of action, bold yet humble, straight yet modest, and above all truthful to the core. All this means an intense, intrinsic love of truth, self-purification and self-introspection, and the determination to live and act in the blazing light of truth, day in and day out.

Imperfect as man is, none can ever say: 'This is the truth'. But all can progressively try to perceive truth and say that, to the best of their knowledge and ability, such and such is 'the truth as they perceive it'. It is this hard fact of our limitations that must make us humble, that must deter us from enforcing our views on others; this is exactly why one should suffer for one's own view of truth rather

than impose suffering on others for it.

Fire burns, light dispels darkness, food is life-giving, the hungry must be fed, misery must be removed, evil must go, injustice must be fought out, truth ultimately prevails—these are all truths, laws which we have come across, which we know and more or less believe in. Every one of us has the faculty of knowing the truth and the laws of life at least dimly; otherwise, we could not have lived even for a single moment. Nothing can be based on unreality. This faculty of perceiving the truth must be sharpened, made keener and more unerring. A clean flat mirror alone can reflect things as they are. It is the serene and rippleless surface of the lake that reflects faithfully the sky above. So we must cleanse our mind of prejudices and selfishness and purify ourselves in order to know the truth in its fullness.

Like knows like, truth sees truth, spirit realises spirit. Unless we try to realise and become spirit we would not know the spirit that pervades the universe. Much less can we identify ourselves with it. As long as we do not become true to ourselves, we would not know truth. The ideal is to know the whole of the truth, act according to it and live wholly in it. It is extremely realizable though it may never be fully realized in our mortal lives. What we ought to do is to strain every nerve to approach that ideal every moment of our lives.

Our mind is the only instrument with which to apprehend truth. It is a wonderful instrument though perhaps imperfect and crude. Our senses serve the mind in this matter. They are not means of a high order either. But they are all that we have, and we have got to depend on them. The senses and the mind are the mirror in which we have to look for truth. It is them that we have to cleanse and purify in order that they may reflect truth faithfully. That again means a clean healthy life both of body and of mind. Discipline, self-control, detachment, selflessness, calmness, courage—all these play a major part in the life of a Satyāgrahī. In fact, a clear and strong character is the very capital with which a satyāgrahī starts his life.

TRUTH AND NONVIOLENCE

In the context of Gandhi's gospel of satyāgraha, I would have as well used the Sanskrit words, satya and ahimsā, which are far more meaningful to the Indian mind. But being conscious that I am writing for English-knowing readers, I am using the words truth and nonviolence. Even so, I should have given the title 'Truth Through Nonviolence Alone' to this chapter, because that is the distinguishing feature of Gandhi's life, thought and action. In Gandhi's philosophy of life and action, truth and nonviolence are like inseparable Siamese twins. As Gandhi grew and evolved the science and art of satyāgraha, truth assumed for him a far more significant and comprehensive meaning than the term God; for in this age of physical sciences and materialism, many would deny God and be agnostics if not sceptics and atheists. But he seemed to question, who dares deny truth to which one's senses and mind are witness? To deny truth would be to deny oneself and one's own being and experience.

For Gandhi, it was not mere perception of truth which mattered; what was more important for him was speaking the truth, acting the truth and realising the truth in every breath of life and action. Self-realisation was another name for realisation and establishment of the truth of life and being. Preception of any particular truth must be followed by a relentless effort to replace untruth and falsehood; in the context of human and social evolution, evil, injustice, exploitation of man by man were but forms of untruth or *asat* (not truth) which have to go—*asato mā sadgamaya*, lead me from untruth to truth, is the ancient invocation of the Upanishad.

But what is truth? Is that question which was asked by 'jesting Pilate' still unanswered? Jesus when confronted asserted that he was telling the truth. Gandhi on his part has tried to answer that question as adequately and satisfactorily as is possible for a human being by experimenting with truth all the time. His sole endeavour has been to answer that question in his life and if necessary by his life. He did so both in his life and by his life.

Gandhi may be said to have envisaged the totality of truth in its two-fold aspect, the transcendant and the immanent. The transcen-

dant aspect is the supreme power, the Reality which is behind the whole law of cause and effect. The immanent aspect is that which we cognise and perceive by our own senses and mind. While the rational element in Gandhi would be satisfied with cognizing as the Reality the impersonal cosmic law which regulates the infinite number of movements of matter, life and mind, there was a strong mystic element also in him. He was in fact an audile mystic whose conscience installed a personal god (the essence of the cosmic law) in his heart to guide him by words while in doubt and distress. But however important and intimate these things might be from the point of view of the personal life and experiences of Gandhi as a spiritual aspirant, what is most important from the social point of view is his view of the immanent truth of the day-to-day experiences of life, and his supreme passion to perceive it, realise it and establish it.

Here I may observe that his quest of the transcendent aspect of truth, which is the ground of all existence, was not less intense than his pursuit of the truth of being and of life, the law of our being—the law of human life and its progress. In fact, the path of his quest for the transcendent truth itself lay through his search for the truth of daily life. That is why he used to say that God is in the hearts of all men and beings and that all life is one and that the search for truth or God has to be through love, the law of identity and through unselfish as well as unstinted service.

But then what was the truth of life or the law of being which was uppermost in his mind? Here I may quote what I have written elsewhere:

Man, in Gandhi's eyes, was the measure. Gandhi's approach to himself, and to life in general, was that of a seeker of truth and of a votary of nonviolence or love. His was a scientific mind and he sought for that law of life and being which would promote the common weal and help man to reach higher elevations of consciousness. He perceived that love, spelt as nonviolence in thought, word and deed, was the shortest cut to human progress and evolution, both individual and social. In his eyes, progressive nonviolence could express itself best through service, self-suffering and, if necessary, total sacrifice. His mind was always open, fresh and receptive to truth as he went on finding it from day-to-day experience. For him, while his own consciousness was the laboratory for searching out the inner core of truth, human society was the field for social experiments

which could lead to harmony and happiness. In whatever corner of the world he worked for the time being, the whole of humanity and its good were always present to him. (*Gandhi: His Relevance for Our Times*, second edition, p. xi.)

When he went to South Africa in 1893, he had occasion to suffer in his own person the insults, injuries and indignities which a self-styled superior race armed with political power could inflict on a so-called inferior people. Now here was a truthful personal experience against the natural law of the equality and equal dignity of man as man. His whole soul rose against that experience but the remedy he sought was a highly civilized and superior one, I mean superior to the common remedy of tit for tat or a tooth for a tooth, which if followed logically and ruthlessly leaves everyone toothless!

This was the deliberate, conscious beginning of the great experiment of returning good for evil, of hating the evil but loving the evil-doer, of converting the opponent by loveful service, by self-suffering and by sacrifice, of nonviolent resistance to evil and injustice, of non-cooperation with evil, of using only good means for good ends, and of establishing truth only through nonviolence; this was the forging of a nonviolent weapon of resistance which depended for its success mainly on the inner strength of the unused and dormant power of the human soul. But this nonviolent power, which would not even so much as dream of injury to person or property, which would not only be free from ill-will but would positively pray for the good of the opponent, depends for its development and effective use on the perception of truth, on purity of motives which would always be selfless, and on the readiness to suffer to the uttermost. That this power can be used only in the service of truth is an axiom which is without any exception. Nonviolence in the service of untruth, evil or injustice is as inconceivable as water serving fire.

In order that there may not be any mistake about the perception of truth, the first criterion is the selflessness and objectivity of the seeker. The second criterion is a deep conviction about the truth, a conviction which would have already considered all counter-evidence about it. The third criterion is a definite and irrevocable determination to see that the truth of one's perception is established only through nonviolent and loveful measures, involving non-cooperation with evil, selfless service, and sacrifice with the fullest measure of love for the good of the opponent and all the opposing hosts.

Let me take here the case history of Champaran so far as the

perception of truth is concerned. A very sincere worker from Bihar reported to Gandhi inequities and indignities being heaped upon the ryots in the district of Champaran by the foreign indigo planters. Evil, injustice and exploitation are always shy of publicity. Gandhi therefore always stood for a bold and fearless exposure of all such things. When Gandhi decided upon going to Champaran to ascertain the truth for himself, the powers that be who were hand in glove with the planters, decided to ban his entry into the district. Gandhi decided to defy the order courteously and the local government had to withdraw the order. But that was only the first step in trying to perceive the real truth. Gandhi camped at Motihari, the headquarters of the district, and began taking evidence in writing. He inspired confidence among the ryots and they boldly came forward with stories of torture, inhuman treatment, illegal levies and so on.

Gandhi got recorded something like 4000 stories from witnesses who were the actual sufferers. It was only after ascertaining the truth in this manner that he took up the cause of the suffering ryots of Champaran. It was no half-baked agitator or ambitious politician or perfunctory journalist with whom Government and the planters had to deal. They had to deal with a seeker of truth armed with the perception of truth and with a selfless determination to establish truth in a nonviolent way.

While Gandhi was second to none in his inward quest for the totality of transcendental truth which philosophers call by the name of Reality, he perceived that that quest would be only partial if he did not address himself to the truth of daily life which was immanent and which was like a reflection of or a window on Reality itself. He saw that human life as all other life and its progress was the immediate and urgent concern of each conscient individual who aimed at seeking truth. He also saw that self-conscious man was struggling hard to transcend himself in order to reach higher dimensions of consciousness. His personal inner struggle was too much with him and he saw that the struggle outside was but the reflection of the struggle inside. That is why he laid so much stress on self-purification and perfection. In fact, he believed in 1921 that one single real satyāgrahī would be enough to bring swarāj. For him, the suffering and misery, the ignorance and poverty, the oppression and exploitation, the evil and injustice rampant around him were experiences which humanity was undergoing. He wanted to find out the law of being, the law of life which could extricate man from his present predica-

ment and show him the path to the Kingdom of Heaven within as well as without. He found that the law of love, of nonviolence, of ahimsā, alone would ensure the future destiny of man—the destiny of universal peace, harmony and happiness.

Gandhi preferred the use of the word ahimsā which has a negative import, meaning non-injury, non-killing. That word, which is as old as the Vedas, assumed new and very positive connotations during his life owing to his constant nonviolent thought and action. It may be safely said that by the end of his career, for him and for all of us ahimsā included nonviolence to person and property as well as love, that is, a complete identity of interest and pursuit of it. Ahimsā does not only mean non-killing and non-injury to and non-destruction of property; it includes not only non-hatred but is equal to love which is the very essence of all identity and is the greatest creative force making for growth, cohesion, harmony and the ultimate ecstasy of happiness.

The greatest merit of the use of ahimsā in a conflict is that it does not evoke or provoke unfavourable and undesirable reactions in the opponent, be he an individual or a group or a nation. The next important thing is that while violence to person and property diverts the mind of the parties concerned from the real issues involved, non-violent action invites the parties to a dialogue about the issues themselves. A common solution of the problem begins to be the objective of both rather than the destruction of each other. On account of the publicizing of the issues and education of the people almost from the beginning of the struggle, it begins to dawn on the parties concerned that the best results and benefits can flow not from mutual destruction but by mutual cooperation. The ridiculousness and the futility of the huge waste of money and energy in piling up and using tools of destruction begin to be apparent. But supposing this favourable reaction to nonviolent action does not come about and the opponent who believes only in violence destroys the nonviolent opponent, even then nonviolent actionists would not lose more than what they would have lost if they had used violence. Gandhi would say, if death is the price for truth—which however never dies—dying for it without killing is far more economical and glorious.

Far more preparations, time, money and energy are required on both sides for any violent conflict, whether it is between individuals or groups within a nation, or whether it is between nations. It is needless to say that the destruction of person and property invol-

ved is not calculable and what is destroyed is not easily replaceable.

Anyway, Gandhi eschewed the path of violence for many reasons, and these he has repeated from time to time in his speeches and writings. But why did he say, once and often, that for him non-violence alone was the path to truth, though when confronted with certain situations he said that if anyone found that he could not use the nonviolence of the brave, he could use violence, that is the path of destruction, in preference to cowardly submission to evil. For instance, if one found that one's daughter is being assaulted or molested by a ruffian and if one has not the bravery to intervene between them and die in the attempt, one should better use violence to prevent the ruffian from having his way. But Gandhi persisted in saying that for himself nonviolence was the only way, as he could not conceive of any other abiding and real way to truth. Even if a nonviolent way was not immediately perceptible under certain circumstances, he said, if love and nonviolence are the royal road to truth and the path to achieve it, there must be a nonviolent way which would reveal itself when the time came and the occasion arose.

One important reason Gandhi gave for sticking to nonviolence as his only way to truth, was that, after all man was fallible and however sure he might be of his perception of truth, he was liable to err and he had no right to impose it by force on others as they were equally competent to assert that what they saw and said was the truth. Therefore, he said that if at all truth was to be conveyed to others, if truth was to be established, it had to be through love, non-violence and persuasion, through service and self-suffering and not by inflicting suffering on others. That was what he meant by 'converting' others to his own truth.

There is another and perhaps far more important reason why he stuck to nonviolence. Gandhi was essentially constructive in his approach. Destruction of any kind, either of life or property was repugnant to him. Life and death, destruction and construction, love and hatred and so on are there as facts of life for all to see. Man is confronted with these opposites. What is man's duty, man who is endowed with reason, with a sense of values and with a conscience which sits in judgment on good and evil? Man must range himself unmistakably and irrevocably on the side of love, construction and life and not on the side of death, destruction and hatred. What right has man to destroy anything while he has no power to create anything, asked Gandhi,

I have described so far what shape ahimsā or nonviolence or love would take when confronted with falsehood, evil or injustice. But that is not the normal way in which love would work. Love in its positive aspect identifies itself with others, with their interests and their well-being. This can best be proved through selfless service, willing sacrifice, and suffering if need be for those who are loved and for causes which are truthful. Gandhi engaged himself throughout life in acts of selfless service and sacrifice for the community, whether he was working among the down-trodden Indians in South Africa, or the distressed ryots in Champaran or in the backward village of Sevagram. It was not a matter of policy for him but a natural out-flow of abundant love. The totality of service to the community he called by the name of Constructive Programme. It included everything on earth which is of physical, mental, moral or spiritual help and significance to the community. This kind of helpful activity forges invisible links of kinship between the individuals who work and the community. These links are so strong that they prove unbreakable.

It can now be easily seen how Gandhi's gospel of nonviolence or love, to the total exclusion of all ill-will even towards one's opponents, overflows in the form of service and sacrifice for the community. This is not possible if love is not nourished and fostered constantly and raised to a high potential. This kind of life of dedication for the service of the people would be the normal life of a satyāgrahī. It is only when confronted with untruth or evil or injustice that the satyāgrahī summons all the powers of love and nonviolence to fight those evils to the last.

Having said that the whole life of Gandhi the satyāgrahī was dedicated to the search and establishment of truth through love and nonviolence alone, I may mention here some of the non-gandhian or un-gandhian techniques of asserting or establishing truth and justice which are likely to be misunderstood, misinterpreted and confused with Gandhian satyāgraha, such as passive resistance, śuddha or 'pure' satyāgraha, durāgraha (insistence on a wrong or untruthful cause), and actions like sudden strikes etc.

The first among them is what is called 'passive resistance'. Gandhi cleared the misunderstanding as early as the South African struggle in Germistone:

As the movement advanced, Englishmen too began to watch it with interest. . . . One of these was Mr Hosken, one of the magnates

of Johannesburg. He had always been free from colour prejudice but his interest in the Indian question deepened after the starting of satyāgraha. The Europeans of Germistone, which is something like a suburb of Johannesburg, expressed a desire to hear me. A meeting was held and introducing me and the movement I stood for to the audience, Mr Hosken observed: 'The Transvaal Indians have had recourse to passive resistance when all other means of securing redress proved to be of no avail. They do not enjoy the franchise. Numerically, they are only a few. They are weak and have no arms. Therefore they have taken to passive resistance which is a weapon of the weak.'

Gandhi reacted very strongly to the wrong conception of Mr Hosken's about the method and measures which he adopted in South Africa.

I have no idea when the phrase 'passive resistance' was first used in English and by whom. But among the English people, whenever a small minority did not approve of some obnoxious piece of legislation, instead of rising in rebellion they took the passive or milder step of not submitting to the law and inviting the penalties of such non-submission upon their heads. When the British Parliament passed the Education Act some years ago, the Non-conformists offered passive resistance under the leadership of Dr Clifford. The great movement of the English women for the vote was also known as passive resistance. It was in view of these two cases that Mr Hosken described passive resistance as a weapon of the weak or the voteless. Dr Clifford and his friends had the vote, but as they were in a minority in the Parliament, they could not prevent the passage of the Education Act. That is to say, they were weak in numbers. Not that they were averse to the use of arms for the attainment of their aims, but they had no hope of succeeding by force of arms. And in a well-regulated state, recourse to arms every now and then in order to secure popular rights would defeat its own purpose. Again some of the Non-conformists would generally object to taking up arms even if it was a practical proposition. The Suffragists had no franchise rights. They were weak in numbers as well as in physical force. Thus their case lent colour to Mr Hosken's observations. The Suffragist movement did not eschew the use of physical force. Some Suffragists fired buildings and even assaulted men. I do not think they ever intended to kill

any one. But they did intend to thrash people when an opportunity occurred, and even thus to make things hot for them.

But brute force had absolutely no place in the Indian movement in any circumstance, and the reader will see, as we proceed, that no matter how badly they suffered, the satyāgrahīs never used physical force, and that too although there were occasions when they were in a position to use it effectively. Again, although the Indians had no franchise and were weak, these considerations had nothing to do with the organization of satyāgraha. This is not to say, that the Indian would have taken to satyāgraha even if they had possessed arms or the franchise. Probably there would not have been any scope for satyāgraha if they had the franchise. If they had arms, the opposite party would have thought twice before antagonizing them. One can therefore understand that people who possess arms would have fewer occasions for offering satyāgraha. My point is that I can definitely assert that in planning the Indian movement there never was the slightest thought given to the possibility or otherwise of offering armed resistance. Satyāgraha is soul force pure and simple, and whenever and to whatever extent there is room for the use of arms or physical force or brute force, there and to that extent is there so much less possibility for soul force. These are purely antagonistic forces in my view, and I had full realization of this antagonism even at the time of the advent of satyagraha. (*Satyāgraha in South Africa*, first edition, p. 112-113.)

This shows that though passive resistance may at times assume the same forms in externals as certain forms of satyāgraha, there are fundamental differences between them both in approach, in motivation, in the process of adoption of measures and in the likely developments during their progress. Satyāgraha eschews violence right from the beginning, not on account of inability to use it but on principle. A satyāgrahī would not use violence at any stage even if he could. Hatred or injury to person or property are foreign to satyāgraha, not coercion but conversion being the aim. The strategy of satyāgraha is always open and is based on the principle of self-suffering rather than on infliction of suffering on others. In its purest form satyāgraha is a corollary of the nonviolent way of life which it represents when adopted as an instrument of truth and justice in bringing about social change.

The second way is what is called śuddha (pure) satyāgraha

adopted by Senapati Bapat, at the time of the Mulshipetha Satyāgraha in Maharashtra in 1920-21. He argued that truth and justice are to be sought and established, but the use of violence without hatred (a surgeon's knife for instance) should not be barred or banned. Along with half-a-dozen followers, he openly attacked a railway train carrying labourers to the spot of the building of the dam near Mulshipetha after giving due notice that he was going to offer what he called śuddha satyāgraha. His band, with Senapati Bapat himself at the head, carried swords as well as a pistol.

They were of course arrested and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, the highest being seven years' rigorous. One can easily see how Senapati Bapat's śuddha satyāgraha is far away from Gandhian satyāgraha. Gandhi never envisaged injury either to person or property. The very carrying of lethal weapons in the name of śuddha satyāgraha is to invite violence both to property and person.

The third category, which may sometimes resemble Gandhian satyāgraha is what he called 'durāgraha'. We are witness to a number of 'durāgrahas' now-a-days. A 'durāgrahi' takes it for granted that what he insists upon as truth or justice is the only truth and justice and adopts tactics which are in externals similar to those of Gandhian satyāgraha. There is more of fanaticism in it which is in fact the worst enemy of truth and coercive measures are adopted which are opposed to the very spirit of nonviolence and Gandhian satyāgraha.

The fourth type of tactics which may resemble satyāgraha in outward form is in the nature of sudden strikes and so on, which may develop violence at any stage, as there is no deliberate preparation for observing nonviolence. It should be noted that at times, such tactics may succeed in their objective. But success or failure is not the test of satyāgraha. It is the principles of truth and the non-violent means adopted which characterize satyāgraha. It is the purity of the means and the moral force which is involved that matters in satyāgraha.

All these seemingly nonviolent methods of resistance or remedies against injustice and evil have nothing in common with Gandhian satyāgraha. They lack the main elements of true satyāgraha, which may be summed up as follows: An earnest search for truth and justice with objectivity as the guide is the first criterion of satyāgraha. The second step is the education of the public and the education of

the opponents of the cause of truth and justice. Every step and preparation of satyāgraha is frank, free and open. The opponents are given due notice of the steps that are contemplated. Service, even of the opponents, self-suffering and utmost sacrifice, which are all willing and voluntary, are the weapons of a satyāgrahī. At every stage, a satyāgrahī seeks a dialogue and is willing to accept a compromise without sacrificing his principles. His aim is not the defeat or liquidation of the opponent, but the persuasion of the opponent with a view to finding a peaceful solution and converting him to his own way of thinking and living.

CHAPTER 7

AHIMŚĀ—LOVE

In the course of a discussion about the use of the word love instead of the word ahimśā, Gandhi said that the word love may be used though love had other associations also. He said that so far as he was concerned, on account of long use and the connotation which had developed in his own mind, he would prefer the word ahimśā. In fact, he used the three words ahimśā, nonviolence and love to mean essentially the same thing, though in different contexts they would convey and connote different degrees of emphasis and varied shades of the same meaning. It is the subtle invisible force which attracts and holds things together, makes for cohesion, preserves unity, promotes common interests and is constructive in essence; that force is the very soul of these three words. For an analogy, we can say that it is the same force which holds the nucleus and the electrons together in the atom, the sun and the planets in the solar system, and the human soul and all that constitutes an individual. By ahimśā, nonviolence, and love Gandhi meant that force. In his famous broadcast on God, he said, 'In the midst of hatred love persists'; he meant thereby a positive, persistent, enduring force that makes for and supports life. In the same context he asserted, 'In the midst of death life persists', and 'In the midst of darkness light persists'. The forces of destruction and death are very much there but they are negative forces and man who is born to live and think and feel and act has to promote the positive forces of life, light and love and fight their negatives of hatred, darkness and death. In fact, the very meaning of life and living is the successful struggle against all negative forces; it is the triumph of the positive over the negative forces working in nature and the cosmic processes.

When one observes nature operating in the cosmos one discerns constant change going on without any intermission even for a moment. This change obviously means the continuous disappearance of one state of things and the appearance of a new state in its place. In the case of the biological world, this change is marked by birth, growth and death. Birth means the coming into existence of a new living being, growth means its development, and death means

its passing away.

Nature seems to be oblivious to what we call good and evil, justice and injustice, life and death. It is one continuous process of change, a cycle of construction and destruction involving all intermediate changes, according to certain laws of cause and effect.

But it is nature itself and the laws of nature themselves which, in the course of evolution, are responsible for the birth of the discriminating faculty in man. We call it conscience, the faculty which judges between good and evil, truth and falsehood, justice and injustice, construction and destruction. If consciousness is one of the main characteristics of the animal kingdom, self-consciousness and its development are the hall-marks of man. It is this faculty which sharpens his conscience, develops introspection, makes him the witness of what goes on even in his own mind, awakens a moral sense in him and enables him to a certain extent to be the master of his own destiny by presenting before him the choice between the alternatives of good and evil and other opposites.

It is because of this development of the conscience that man is under the supreme necessity and responsibility of judging between right and wrong, good and evil, justice and injustice, truth and falsehood. Further, once he has made the choice, the duty devolves on him to pursue the truth and eschew the false, to follow the good and abandon the evil, to establish justice in place of injustice and so on.

It is here that Gāndhī lays down the guideline for man through his gospel of ahimsā, nonviolence, love. Man is placed in the midst of constructive and destructive forces. He is placed between life and death, between love and hatred, between peace and war. Gāndhī says that man must range himself on the side of life, on the side of love, on the side of peace. There are forces making for harmony and disharmony, for concord and discord, for good and evil, for health and disease, for knowledge and ignorance. Gāndhī's call to man, through his utter stress on ahimsā, nonviolence and love, is for lining up with the forces of harmony, concord, health and knowledge. He takes an unshakable stand on this matter as he believes the mission of man and the purpose of human life to be the realisation of truth, the law of being through ahimsā, nonviolence, love.

Ahimsā is an ancient Sanskrit word. It is the negation and non-existence of himsā, i.e. killing or injury. Ahimsā therefore, means, non-injury, non-killing. While non-injury includes non-killing, non-killing does not necessarily include non-injury. To be precise, it is

better to translate *ahiṃsā* by the English word non-injury instead of non-killing. The word is as old as the Vedas and the Upaniṣads, i.e. at least about three thousand years. *Ahiṃsā* is always mentioned as one of the observances and virtues necessary for a spiritual aspirant. It is essential for any human and moral way of life. It is the basis of all ethical conduct. It is the foundation of all social life. Not even two persons can get together and cooperate if they do not observe the code of non-injury between themselves. All fear and distrust of a person stems from real or imaginary, possible or probable injury from the other person. Non-injury to person and property thus becomes a fundamental principle of all human life, of social organisation and onward progress.

It is not intended here to give the whole history of the word *ahiṃsā* or of the importance of the prime virtue of non-injury as it developed in India. It is enough to say that while in the Upaniṣads and the *Gītā* it is mentioned as a necessary observance for spiritual elevation and self-realisation, *ahiṃsā* attained greater significance in Jainism and Buddhism which emphasised ethical conduct more than anything else. Neither of those faiths believe in God as such, and religion for them consists first and foremost in purity of life and excellence in ethical conduct. Jainism declared that *ahiṃsā* is the highest law, *ahiṃsā paramo dharmah*. Buddha in the *Dhammapada*, the Path of the Law, said that hatred cannot be wiped out by hatred, nor can anger be appeased by counter-anger. It is by *ahiṃsā* that one can nullify hatred and it is by non-anger that one can conquer or subdue anger in others.

Ahiṃsā or non-injury to other creatures or sentient beings is a concept and a rule of conduct which developed in different ways and on account of different considerations in India in Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism. The Sanātana Dharma (*yeṣa dharmah sanātanaḥ*—this is the eternal law) as Hinduism was called before foreigners called this land 'Hindu' (from river Sindhu—Indus) believed and still believes in the oneness of spirit. Injury to the other is ultimately injury to oneself because there is no other but only one and indivisible being. It is this inner experience which Gandhi voiced when he said, 'All life is one'. With this experience in the background on the spiritual level, what can be the real relationship between one being and another except that of *ahiṃsā* or non-injury? *Ahiṃsā* in positive terms would mean not merely non-injury but positive will to action for the well-being of the other even at the sacrifice of oneself. Sym-

pathy, empathy, compassion are but faint reflections of the feeling of oneness. Love, that is, identity of interest in the form of tender emotions and selfless service and sacrifice is the utmost expression of that inner, subjective spiritual experience of oneness.

One of the important considerations in Jainism regarding ahimsā is that every atom, be it living or non-living, is on a grand march towards perfection, that is arhat-hood. It is the duty of each one, each entity, to help the other to attain that cherished perfection. But the least one can do is to refrain from coming in the way of the progress of the other—that is ahimsā, non-injury to the other. Jainism does not believe in a God or God-head. It does believe in arhat-hood, the perfected Being.

Buddhism too does not believe in God as a creator and so on. But it believes in the cessation of all causes of sorrow and he who attains the sorrowless state of nirvāṇa attains Buddha-hood. Himsā to any creatures, in contrast to ahimsā, gives rise to the reaction of himsā in the other, which results in sorrow. So one of the ways to cut at the root of all sorrow is to refrain from acts, feelings, thoughts which would bring in their train sorrow and disturbance to the equanimity of the mind. Perfect equanimity is the very essence of nirvāṇa.

Gandhi was born in a Vaiṣṇava Bania family. His mother was a devout Hindu believing in and following strictly the practices of worship, prayer, fasts and so on. Early in life Gandhi came in contact with Raichand, a Jaina jeweller who influenced him deeply in the spiritual way. If the story and drama of Hariścandra impressed Gandhi in the matter of following the truth and keeping the plighted word to the last breath, the significant verse of the Gujarati poet Shamalbhat, 'to return good for good is natural, but what is magnificent is to return good for evil', sank into his heart and all hatred disappeared from there. When hatred for any one is itself absent, how can the idea of injury to any one be born there? Since then Gandhi developed the idea of separating the evil doings of a man from the man himself. To love the man as a human soul, but to wean him from his evil ways became the rule for him. This rule extended to whole peoples. He loved the British and claimed to be their best friend but hated their imperialism and the British system of Government in India since it was an instrument of ruthless exploitation of one nation by another.

Gandhi never made a secret of the faith and fact that self-realisa-

tion, God-realisation, Truth-realisation, of the law of being, was the aim and purpose not only of his own life but of the whole of humanity. This was for him the truth of life. Every breath that he drew and every action that he did was with a view to realise that truth. He was full of humility as regards what he did, and looked upon himself as an instrument of God. He declared many times that truth could be attained only through *ahimsā*, nonviolence, love. So for him, first and foremost, absolute *ahimsā* and all its forms were the pathway to spiritual progress. To see God face to face, to realise truth at every step, to feel the presence of truth and act in that presence was his constant endeavour.

While inwardly this was his ceaseless *sādhana* or spiritual discipline, while every moment he felt his identity with humanity, their sufferings, their ignorance, their aspiration, what outward form did this attitude take? Love, total identity of interest could but take only one form and that was selfless service without end and total sacrifice if need be. What he called the constructive programme consisting of removal of untouchability, literacy, basic education, village industries, uplift of women, rural uplift and uplift of the masses, and so was the full expression of his love of humanity. In fact, all this activity had but one final aim, the evolution of a classless and casteless society, a raceless humanity where no one was superior or inferior according to birth or colour, and all had equal opportunity. This was the *sarvodaya* society, endeavouring for the well-being of all, which he aimed at establishing.

As a realist and as a 'practical idealist' as he called himself, he knew that there was no smooth sailing. He declared that love is the law of the human species as violence is the law of the jungle. But the millenium was yet to dawn and many a nonviolent battle had yet to be fought. Every evil, every act of injustice, every tyrannical rule, every weakness of the human mind, every wicked thought of selfishness had to be fought by nonviolent means and by the organisation of the moral forces which at present lie dormant. Pure means alone would achieve good ends. In doing this, his love of humanity and his search for truth took the form of loveful resistance to evil aimed at the conquest of all evil. If attainment of spiritual unity through love, devotion and prayer was the *satyāgraha* way of life, it took the form of a struggle against evil, and injustice when that way was confronted with the forces which obstructed progress and debased human nature.

Ahimsā, nonviolence, love did not remain only individual moral virtues or excellences in the case of Gandhi. Nor were they only means for individual salvation which in many cases is the highest end. As in the case of Buddha, maitrī (friendliness), karuṇā (compassion), and kalyāṇa (good of others) overflowed from his heart and bathed the whole of humanity. Gandhi's upsurging emotion of love issued wave after wave in the form of service of the people and filled his every activity which was conducive to their economic, social and spiritual emancipation. But this too was not enough, nor was it the final end for him, because these constructive activities could hardly be carried on without overcoming the obstructions in the way; and that is where Gandhi rose supreme to the heights of a nonviolent hero who fought without arms the mightiest empire and demonstrated the strength of the soul-force inherent in man. It is this successful example of the operation of soul-force which has created a new hope for the application of the satyāgraha principle in international affairs as well. Now when nuclear and other weapons have become self-destructive and world-destructive, it is necessary to discover new ways other than war and violence of finding and establishing truth and justice. Then only a really peaceful, harmonious and happy world can emerge.

So, in Gandhi, both truth and nonviolence have reached new dimensions and he has proved that they can be the instruments of individual elevation as well as the means of human emancipation and that they can also be weapons for establishing the reign of peace and justice.

PRINCIPLES OF SATYĀGRAHA

We will now proceed to consider the basic principles of satyāgraha. As we have shown before, satyāgraha seeks to extend to groups and communities the laws of love and self-suffering associated with the conduct of domestic life. Its basic assumption is the essential goodness of human nature; it holds that temporary aberrations of brother-humans would pass away if the right attitude, namely, of love and self-suffering, is adopted. The origin of this relationship based on love is to be sought in the intuitive or mystic realization of the oneness of all life. Unless there is a strong emotional realisation of this kind of oneness, how can one say that he would suck the poison out of the wound of his murderer if he were bitten by a serpent even during the very act of murder? Nor is this experience of oneness un-understandable. Today even the physical sciences have come to the conclusion that what exists is the one energy, and all matter is but the expression of it in terms of different stresses. To put it in Aldous Huxley's words: 'The material universe is pictured by science as composed of a diversity of patterns of a single substance'. When this is the case with gross matter, a kind of unity might well pervade the subtler existence of consciousness and life. To one who experiences that all life is one, all consciousness is one, all spirit is one, it is as vivid as the sky is blue. How others look upon this experience of his is not relevant to him. It is in this experience of oneness and identity that we find the origin of love. When one feels that 'others' are himself, he is bound to love and attract them. There is no escape from it. The satyāgrahī does not feel that his blood-relations alone are his family. It is no rhetoric when Gandhi said that the world was his family. It was his intense feeling and fundamental experience. He lived in that experience and his whole nervous system was attuned to that exhilarating emotion. Thus the satyāgrahī looks upon none as his enemy. Everyone is a friend, a fellow being, a brother. The satyāgrahī, instead of physically resisting wrong, suffers it bravely and cheerfully as something done by his own brother and thus attempts to reach the heart of the wrong-doer. He separates the evil from the evil-doer and while

trying to eradicate evil, tries to save the evil-doer by making him cognizant of the evil. This is precisely the attitude of a brother, a father, a sister, a mother. They never doubt that the aberration of a brother, a son, are temporary; that the loved one can be weaned from his errant ways by loving patience, by self-sacrifice. They only try to eradicate the evil in the loved one without injuring the loved one himself. The satyāgrahī makes the opponent feel that he is loved and respected and that he must divest himself of the evil that he harbours or clings to. To destroy the evil without injuring the evil-doer is the great task that the satyāgrahī sets for himself. By suffering himself and by assuring his opponent of his physical safety, he sets him thinking about the wrong he has committed. Thus his attack is on the opponent's mind and the processes of his thinking and feeling and he aims at curing evil at its source.

The extension of this rule of conduct to all fields of activity transforms satyāgraha from an individual virtue into a social force. As we look back, we see many instances of individual satyāgrahis among the saints. But rare are the instances where satyāgraha has been deliberately and with full consciousness used as a social force. Great saints, religious preachers, or groups of saints adopted this attitude in their individual lives for religious and spiritual purposes. They led a religious life divorced from the normal life of men. Most of them avoided politics, commerce, trade, etc., which involved wealth, power, ambition, possession; they led isolated lives cut off from society. This led to a divorce between religion and politics, which in turn led to the adoption of a double standard of morality, one for the religious life, another for the secular; one for the individual life, another for the group or national life; one for the private life, another for statecraft. What was virtue in one pattern of life was a vice in another. If truth was a virtue in private and personal life, it was at a discount in politics and diplomacy. If killing was bad in individual life, it was gallantry in war. If gentlemanliness, goodness, frankness were private virtues, they were disqualifications when nations dealt with nations, groups with groups. Gandhi aimed at wiping out all such duplicity and double standards. That is what he meant by saying that he wanted to spiritualize politics. He wanted to measure things by the single standard of truth and establish it by love through self-suffering.

This is where Gandhi differs from all previous teachers of humanity. He has taught mankind to extend their domestic attitude

towards wrong-doers in the family, to wrong-doers in general. He simply says: 'Satyāgraha can be used in the political sphere precisely as in the domestic sphere'. Nay, he goes further and says that he who fails in the domestic sphere and seeks to apply it only in the political or the social sphere will not succeed.

Gandhi is a karmayogī par excellence. He has no use for empty cathedra preaching of lofty principles. He teaches noble ideals and practising them, and that is how he has taught the application of the great principles of truth, love and nonviolence to politics, economic questions and other social fields. So far, they have been private virtues, a close preserve of the family, very much like women's purdah, too good and pure to stand the contamination, and the storm and stress of extra-domestic life. Gandhi has destroyed this artificial purdah or seclusion of private and public affairs. In his attempt he has sought to sweep away all duplicity and secrecy and established a single scale of values. In his method, there is no scope for prevarication or double-dealing at any stage. To him life is integral. Individual life and social life, religion and politics, personal virtue and public virtue are not to be seen with different eyes. If one is not to lie to God, he is not to lie to anyone. Thus he has given a rude shock to many conventions and made society think in a fresh way by insistence on truth, inner and outer. His whole life is 'an experiment with truth'. There is no dogma about his truth. He does not want his experiences to be crystallized or petrified. Truth does not congeal into rigid forms. It flows with life and life floats on it. He wants each man to discover his own truth and follow it at all costs. According to Gandhi, each man and woman has reserves of spiritual force in him or her. Man is not a mere lump of sensitive flesh to be beaten into submission by any passing tyrant. He is a spirit in a body. 'The whole science of satyāgraha was born from the knowledge of the fundamental truth that the tyrant may have power over the body and earthly possessions of the satyāgrahī but not over his soul', writes Gandhi. He declared that every man, woman and child can practise satyāgraha. The old and the young, the rich and the poor can become satyāgrahīs. They have only to prepare their minds and become conscious of the great power in them and they can face Satan himself. Herein lies Gandhi's originality. He often said 'What I can do everyone must be able to do'. The downtrodden and the oppressed of the earth were depressed, crestfallen. He hypnotized them. They were feeling helpless against the arm-

might of their oppressors, and this 'little frail man with penetrating eyes, a deep insight into human nature, with faith in God and an indomitable will' stood up and said: 'You are not weak. You can blunt the bayonets and silence the rifles if you bare your breasts without fear to them.' And so it happened.

From the point of view of those who would use violence if they could, satyāgraha is a weapon of the weak, of the unarmed, and of the helpless. But to a satyāgrahī, it is the weapon of the strongest and the bravest, because he believes that violence is but the result of fear and therefore a sign of weakness of spirit and not of strength. Whether a party is physically weak or strong, whether it has weapons of destruction or not is immaterial from a satyāgrahī's point of view. Whether one is inspired by love or by hate and fear, whether one is out to suffer or inflict suffering, whether one is out to convert or compel his opponent by moral force or coerce him by physical might, is all that a satyāgrahī is concerned with. In his eyes, all fear, hatred, violence, secrecy, and every tendency to inflict suffering on others is a sign and symbol of moral and spiritual weakness. Therefore, he would always urge others to be strong in spirit, strong on the moral and mental plane and overwhelm the opponent by love and self-suffering. But in case one is not able to resist injustice and evil by love, a satyāgrahī would not tolerate or connive at either inaction or cowardly running away. He would rather prefer violent resistance to inaction or cowardice, though he would not make the mistake of calling it by the name of satyāgraha. Thus in the scale of value, a satyāgrahī would put nonviolent resistance and suffering unto death or victory as the highest virtue. If that is not possible, he would allow violent resistance till death or victory, as the next best. But in the face of injustice and evil there is no place for supine submission, cowardly running away, or corpse-like inaction. Non-resistance to evil, if it means inaction or submission or cowardliness, is taboo. He does not want, he would not brook any inactive or cowardly person: he would say, 'Resist you must if you would be men'. After all, if both are for resistance to evil in a particular case, violence and non-violence, though poles apart, are nearer to each other than to cowardice or inaction.

Romain Rolland, while writing about the make-up of Gandhi, says: 'No one has a greater horror of passivity than this tireless fighter, who is one of the most heroic incarnations of a man who resists. The soul of his movement is the active force of love, faith.

and sacrifice.' No coward can hide under Gandhi's banner. 'Better violence than cowardice', he says. 'Where there is a choice between cowardice and violence, I advise violence. . . . I cultivate the quiet courage of dying without killing. But to him who has not this courage I advise that of killing and of being killed, rather than that of shamefully fleeing from danger. For he who runs away commits mental violence. He runs away because he has not the courage to be killed while he kills. But I believe that nonviolence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness more manly than punishment.' Thus wrote Gandhi as far back as in 1920. All this shows that what is predominant in Gandhi's mind is resistance to evil at all costs. According to him, 'Resist not evil' would mean 'Resist not evil with evil but resist evil with good at all costs, but resist. Resistance is better than cowardly non-resistance.'

In a similar way, to the expression, 'Love thy neighbour as thyself' he would add, 'And everyone, nay, every living creature is thy neighbour'.

His distinction between the evil and the evil-doer and his principle of non-cooperation with evil are very helpful. Again the words of Romain Rolland: 'As man has not been given the power to create, he has not the right to destroy the smallest creature that lives. There must be no hatred for anyone, not even for the evil-doer; but this does not mean that one should tolerate evil. Gandhiji would nurse General Dyer if he were ill, but if his own son lived a life of shame, he would not help him by continuing to support him. On the contrary, using Gandhiji's own words, "my love for him would require me to withdraw all support from him, although that might even mean his death". No one has the right to compel another by physical force to become good because that would not last. Again to quote Gandhiji's own words, "But one is under the obligation to resist him (a wrong-doer) by leaving him, no matter what may happen, and by welcoming him to one's bosom if he repents."'

The twin authors of *The Dawn of Indian Freedom* have rightly remarked: 'Probably the most original and significant of all Mahatma Gandhi's contributions to the thought of the world will be found in his idea of satyāgraha or nonviolent resistance, as a weapon to be used not only by individuals but also by groups and nations to settle international disputes. Dīnabandhu Andrews refers to the uniqueness of Gandhi's methods in his *What I Owe to Christ*. He first met Gandhi in South Africa in 1913 when he was comparatively unknown

to the world. He was in the midst of the South African campaign. Referring to this meeting Rev. Andrews wrote in 1931: 'In him, from the very first, I felt instinctively that there had come into the world, not only a new religious personality of the highest order, moving the hearts of men and women to incredible sacrifice, but also a new religious truth, which yet was not new, but old as the stars and the everlasting hills. His one message was that long suffering and redeeming love alone are invincible. . . . I found this in evidence throughout the whole South African struggle.'

Long ago when somebody said to Gandhi that there were no examples of mass satyāgraha in history, he replied that that need not deter him. On the eve of the 1932 movement Gandhi was amidst the Karnāṭaka workers in Bombay. One of the workers said that there was not a single instance in history where swaraj had been won by nonviolence. Gandhi simply smiled and said: 'We are writing new history'. That shows that Gandhi was not only original in the application of satyāgraha to mass conflicts but also he was intensely conscious of the fact that that was an original method.

In this connection Gandhi's broadcast talk to America from Kingsley Hall, London, in 1930 is noteworthy. He referred to the Indian struggle in the following words: 'The reason for the struggle which has drawn the attention of the world does not lie in the fact that we Indians are fighting for our liberty, but in the fact that the means adopted by us have not been adopted by any other people of whom we have a record. The means adopted are not bloodshed, not violence, not diplomacy as one understands it nowadays, but they are purely and simply truth and nonviolence.'

beginning of the Second World War: 'I have been practising, with scientific precision, nonviolence and its possibilities for an unbroken period of over fifty years. I have applied it in every walk of life—domestic, institutional, economic, and political.' In another place, he said that it could be used against constituted authority, as was being repeatedly done in India. This can of course be classified as the political field. It is to claim and wrest a political right of a whole people from the unwilling hands of alien rulers that the Indian struggle was going on. In the same way, he said that it could be used to prevent communal disturbances by facing both the enraged parties with our lives in our palms and with a reasoned appeal on our lips. Then it can be used against invaders from outside by keeping ready death-squads who would lay down their lives before murderous hordes. Total non-cooperation may be practised against those who might advance in spite of the death-squads. However, Gandhi says that to begin with, the best field for satyāgraha is the domestic one; and that can be extended, because to one who wishes to use satyāgraha as a weapon, the whole world is one family. He says that the alphabet of ahimsā is best learnt in the domestic school and that if one succeeds there, he is sure to succeed everywhere else. It can be used against dacoits and robbers as well. In fact, there is no limit to the fields in which it can be effectively used.

Then, by whom can it be used? One thing is plain, that no one who has no moral and mental strength in him can use this weapon. Only when one is armed with adequate moral strength does one become invincible, if the cause is truthful and if one is willing to suffer cheerfully to the end without ill-will. Physical weakness or belonging to the weaker sex is no disqualification. Even children are seen using this weapon without knowing its theory. A single individual can start using this weapon against any injustice. Groups, communities, societies, as well as nations can adopt the satyāgraha method.

Against whom can this weapon be used? Inherently, satyāgraha is not a weapon which is calculated to be used against any person as such. It aims at evil and seeks to remove it. Evil, in fact, is a common enemy to both the satyāgrahī and the person against whom satyāgraha seems to be ostensibly directed. Evil or injustice exhibits itself and operates through an individual or a group. Thus satyāgraha has to direct itself seemingly against persons, though in fact it loves the persons and hates only the evil. It wants to help the persons to get rid of the evil. Satyāgraha is no respecter of persons and

it does not discriminate because it loves all. But it wishes to hunt down evil wherever it is. Therefore, the problem that confronted Arjuna in the *Gītā*, as to how he could raise his arm against his relatives, does not arise in a nonviolent battle. This weapon can be used as much against our kith and kin, as against strangers or the bitterest enemies. It is a weapon of love and never looks upon any as strangers, nor does it intend harm to anybody. Love burns itself and never others. It always blesses both ways. Whoever represents injustice for the time being becomes the target. May be it is a government, an individual, a community, a whole society, a nation. But there should be no mistaking the fact that satyāgraha is meant to hit the evil and not the evil-doer. It is an approach to the person's heart and understanding through love and patient self-suffering.

CHAPTER 10

SATYĀGRAHA—A WAY OF LIFE

The most important aspects of satyāgraha are two. It is a way of life as well as a weapon for fighting all evil and injustice, social, economic and political.

Satyāgraha as a way of life means the total acceptance of its philosophy of truth through nonviolence alone, and a ceaseless endeavour to live up to that ideal. Truth and nonviolence are as old as the hills and yet, satyāgraha as embodied in Gandhi's life, is as fresh as the green grass. He has enriched the contents of satyāgraha as a way of life.

Life is a process by which the vital urge assimilates and stores inorganic energy, explodes it in suitable action and marches on pushed on by those very explosions. Thus life is action first and action last. Life is neither intellection nor contemplation nor imagination. It is an urge that gushes forth into action. Intellect tries to explain life and indecisively plies between alternatives of action; contemplation tries to suspend the flow of life and probe into its mysteries; imagination tries to play with its problems. But life rushes on and he who is nearest right action truly adds to the dynamics of life. Gandhi's approach is that of a man of action who is extremely careful to see that he is in tune with the truth of life, with its primary urges and its constructive force, namely love.

A satyāgrahī is bound by his creed to fight all injustice and evil, by his unique method of love and self-suffering. Here is the link between satyāgraha as a way of life and satyāgraha as a weapon to fight evil. The satyāgrahī offers to the stricken world a new and more civilized, and none the less a more effective weapon.

Truth has been the goal of all religions, of all philosophies, and of all great men. Nay, every powerful conqueror like Alexander, Napoleon, or even Hitler may well say that he was following his own vision of 'truth'. What then is there that is peculiar about satyāgraha? There is something unique and significant in satyāgraha which is its hall-mark; it is the small phrase 'truth through love'. Satyāgraha is the search after truth through love, self-suffering, nonviolence and nonviolence alone. That constitutes its significant feature and

differentiates it from all other methods of the quest for truth. It is the doctrine of reaching truth by way of nonviolence or love; and nonviolence and love here are synonymous. We may say that active nonviolence is love and passive love is nonviolence, or nonviolence when active is love and love when passive is nonviolence. A satyāgrahī would cheerfully sacrifice himself in being good and doing good to others. The least that he would begin with is to refrain from doing injury to others. The literal meaning of nonviolence denotes the latter attitude, though by usage and connotation, nonviolence in Gandhi's writings has come to mean full-fledged, active, aggressive love that suffers and is ready to sacrifice its all. He has remarked that 'non-violence' was not a good rendering of ahimsā and that love or goodwill would be a better substitute.

Now let me state the mystical, philosophical and ethical basis of this doctrine of satyāgraha. Mysticism relies on a direct apprehension of truth. It believes in an intuitive cognition of truth, not by intellect alone but by one's whole being. Intellect may not sometimes agree in the beginning, but it has to fall in line later. Intellect is essentially analytical and explanatory. It loves to analyse, separate, specialize and follow single lines. That is its tendency. But intuition is synthetic, it grasps truth as a whole and integrally. Mystics of all ages and of all climes have experienced the oneness of spirit, of consciousness, of life. Their highest aim has been to live a unitive life, in tune with the Infinite. A satyāgrahī subscribes completely to this view of unity. In ecstatic experience he realizes and lives in that oneness. His constant endeavour is to realize that experience in his day-to-day life. To him there is no 'other' in the world. Love, in essence the feeling of identity, is a corollary of the experience of oneness with all. Aldous Huxley has said: 'Nonviolence is the practical consequence that follows from belief in the fundamental unity of all being'. 'Love thy neighbour as thyself', 'Do unto others as you would be done by', are but pale reflections of the brilliant experience of unitive life. That is why Gandhi says that all life is sacred, to injure any life is to injure oneself, to injure God.

This inner experience is the mystical basis of satyāgraha. It follows that a satyāgrahī should endeavour to realize in action this truth seen and experienced by him in his vision. He can do that only by progressively ceasing to feel separate and by identifying himself with every creature he comes in contact with.

While on the emotional plane he loves all and embraces the

universe in his grasp, in the field of action he begins with those who are nearest him. That is the process of love. Love inspires us to give our all, to give ourselves up while doing good to those whom we love. Injury, hate, anger, and above all selfish desire which is the root of these, have no place in the kingdom of love. A satyāgrahī's life is one continuous process of doing good to all. If crossed in his path, he chooses the way of suffering and final sacrifice, if need be. He either succeeds in converting or compelling the reactionary forces or dies in the attempt. For him, both are equally a triumph, as both equally vindicate the truth of the oneness of life. The mother who dies to save her child is as happy as the mother who lives after saving her child. Her own life is of no consequence to her. Her love and her attempt to save her child is all that matters to her. She dies in triumph enveloped in a smile if she feels that she is dying in an attempt to save her child. She is equally triumphant if she succeeds in her attempt and lives on.

While mysticism depends upon intuition, philosophy draws its strength from intellect and logic. Mystic knowledge is attained by identity, by meditation. Philosophic knowledge is by observation and logic, by the process of inference. Philosophers too have arrived at the conclusion that a single spirit pervades the universe and that the one underlies the many. Many scientists have come to a similar conclusion in the field of matter. There is apparent physical diversity but underlying this diversity is a physical unity. The diversity is not an illusion but a relative reality. There is greater reality on the higher level of consciousness and it is for us to decide whether we wish to live on the plane of diversity and separateness, or on the plane of unity and oneness. The former way leads to separateness, fear, isolation, egotism, hate, conflict, and destruction. The latter leads to oneness, love, sacrifice, joy, harmony, higher knowledge, unitive life and the glories of it. It may be that till I have a body and its consciousness, I may not be able to realize fully the oneness of spirit. But I can certainly begin to tread the path to oneness rather than to separateness, to concord rather than to conflict, to love rather than to hatred.

This brings us to the ethical field. That path which takes us to the highest point of union, harmony and happiness in human life is good for us. That which leads the other way is evil. We must take the good and reject the evil. Ethics would always support satyāgraha and the satyāgrahī's standpoint. It is only a double standard of

morality, one for the individual and another for a group or a nation, that today makes all diplomacy, patriotic murder, intrigue and espionage look like virtues. Ethics does not recognize such a double standard. The satyāgrahī pursues truth through love or nonviolence alone. He seeks the good of all through service and sacrifice. That is his normal love-inspired life. If anyone crosses his path, or does not allow him to do his duty, or lives in a way contrary to his own, he invites suffering on himself rather than inflict it on the others. He suffers even unto death for truth. While defending truth, if death comes to him through a blow from his erring brother, he considers it to be a triumph, the triumph of the spirit over the body. Rather than consent to falsehood he would lose his body and save his soul. To him the body is but an instrument for the realization of truth through love. He would not swerve even by a hair's breadth from the path of love or nonviolence. However much he may suffer, he would not harbour even the slightest ill-will against his opponent. He does not fight physically or oppose the persecutor but cheerfully suffers and if need be, at times dies at his hand. He does not retaliate even if he has the power to do so. He rests in the supreme faith that his suffering alone would cure the opponent of his ignorance selfishness and cruelty. While he does not spare any means to convince him of his folly, he goes on suffering all indignities and tortures and continues to bear the greatest goodwill towards him.

Satyāgraha is an attitude towards life and towards every aspect of life. It is not a single act or a string of actions. It is an inner consonance with the evolutionary force that goes to build life, promote it, expand it, and express it in various constructive and creative activities. This attitude makes a satyāgrahī strive for the prevalence of truth, the prevalence of right. The light of reason and the ethical attitude are his sole guides in life.

CHAPTER 11

SATYĀGRAHA—A TOOL FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

A satyāgrahī has immense faith in the inherent goodness of human nature and he believes that it responds to love, to service, to suffering and to sacrifice. He believes that the law of love works like the law of gravitation, whether we know it or not, accept it or not. It is in that faith and not in the spirit of desperate bravado, that he is willing to fling his life away at the critical moment. If this gamble succeeds, it is good enough. Even if it does not, the truth abides that the blood of martyrs is the seed of future heroes.

If in the course of his activities, a satyāgrahī is opposed by forces of evil and reaction, he gives battle to them with dauntless courage. It is not in weakness that he eschews violence, but in the belief that it is the weapon of the weak in spirit. He makes himself doubly sure that truth, as he conceives it, is on his side and then even if he is alone he goes forth to fight the evil. He has no ill-will towards the evil-doer. He approaches him with utter sympathy and infinite patience. He is prepared to suffer even unto death. He believes that by suffering alone he can bridge the gulf between himself and his opponent and reach his heart. His is not to win by inspiring fear but by awakening the sense of fairness in his opponent. He cultivates intelligent public opinion in favour of the cause he advocates and proceeds to fight for it forearmed with that opinion.

Satyāgraha is never launched for personal gain but is always used for the good of others. A satyāgrahī who is actively nonviolent refuses to obey repugnant laws and cheerfully suffers the consequences. He uses soul-force or love-force. But before using this force he exhausts all other remedies. If there is a government that does not concede the reasonable and just demands of a people, satyāgrahis would say that they would no longer be their petitioners, or be governed by them, or have any dealings with them. They would no doubt draw the wrath of the government by this step. But they would suffer the brutal might of the tyrant cheerfully but unbendingly. Thus they would employ soul-force, the only alternative under such circumstances being armed force which they have forsworn.

The satyāgrahī pursues his path with the single-mindedness of

a tight-rope walker, When he encounters evil he resists it with all his might. The word 'defeat' does not find a place in his vocabulary, for even death in the attempt to win over his enemies is but a triumph of the spirit over the body. While fighting obstinately for his cause, he is ever willing to compromise with his opponent, provided that it does not involve humiliation and surrender of essentials. This is because he is never dogmatic about his own apprehension of truth and is always ready to consider the other side.

The satyāgrahī offers to the suffering world a new and a more harmless, and yet a more noble weapon. He knows that it may not be immediately practicable for all to adopt his new way of life. Nor is it his immediate purpose to convert all by any mechanical baptism. Therefore, when he sees groups of men and women suffering from some grievances, he would be satisfied to offer his services with an appeal to adopt satyāgraha. If they accept the offer, he would study the circumstances and lay down a certain discipline for all those who would adopt satyāgraha as a temporary weapon to fight a particular grievance. But it is essential for success that those who adopt it even for a particular purpose follow the discipline they have accepted. This is as plain as that a patient ought to follow the regimen recommended to him by a doctor during his treatment. Here we have the distinction between the life-long discipline of a satyāgrahī and the temporary discipline of one who adopts satyāgraha as a weapon for a particular purpose. But even a policy is a temporary creed and must hold good for the time being.

It is advisable that men of faith sponsor and take the initiative in a satyāgraha campaign. There are likely to be fewer mistakes and more chances of success if such men take the lead and guide the movements. Gandhi himself led the great national movements in 1919, 1921 and 1930. In 1930, the resolution of the Congress Working Committee (14 February) laid down that those who believed in nonviolence as an article of faith should initiate civil disobedience movements and others should follow. This procedure would certainly ensure a better conduct of every campaign.

Satyāgraha is certainly intended to replace the brutal methods of violence used in cases of conflict between men. It is based on truth, works through nonviolence, and achieves its end by converting or by compelling the opponent through moral pressure. One who wishes to adopt the method as a weapon must have at least a working faith in it. This method has a great advantage over all others. You

can adopt it against any adversary, however strong physically he might be, and however efficient in the art of violence. You might be the weakest physically and wholly innocent of the use of violence and yet, if you are fearless and have a strong will, you can cross swords with the mightiest of the earth, even single-handed. Numbers do not count. It is essentially a moral weapon and you do not need the weight of numbers. But the fact that it is a moral weapon imposes an obligation not to use it for an immoral purpose or when one is not oneself cleansed of the immorality against which one is fighting. One can start on this path only after self purification. For instance, a slave-owner cannot offer satyāgraha against exploitation of human labour, nor can one use satyāgraha for getting usurious interest. He must at least refrain from doing harm to his opponent in word and deed if not in thought. Then, he must be willing to suffer to the utmost for the cause he has taken up. He may not believe in the actual conversion of the opponent. But he can have learnt enough from the satyāgraha campaigns that have been fought and won so far, that there is a compelling force in the weapon which is as effective as that of any other method.

Now let us suppose that masses of men are involved in a certain campaign. What is the maximum discipline that we expect of them? In the first place, there must be a heartfelt desire in them to get rid of the particular grievance against which they are up in arms. They must have confidence in their leaders. Whatever happens and however grave the provocation, they must remain nonviolent. There should be unity among them and practical unanimity in working. They must be willing to suffer cheerfully and should not expect any financial help from the organizers. It is not essential that the masses should have assimilated all the implications of nonviolence. It is sufficient if the organizers have done so and the masses have faith in them. They must render disciplined obedience to the organizers till the end. Just as in a battle we do not expect each soldier to know what the general knows, here too we do not expect the masses to know what the organizer knows. It is sufficient if the masses have as much faith and discipline as soldiers in an army. This does presuppose training, which must be given them in the course of the constructive work that should usually precede a campaign of satyāgraha.

To one for whom satyāgraha is a way of life, its use as a weapon of defence and attack is no new thing. He disdains using any other method, believing as he does in its superiority and supreme efficacy.

His opponent might be an individual, a community or a constituted authority. His weapon would be one and the same. He never feels weak, daunted or defeated. He either succeeds or dies in the attempt, without injury to any body. Either way his triumph is complete. Such is not the case with those who adopt satyāgraha as a weapon. Either they have some alternative method but choose this as the best under the circumstances or they see that this method is an inevitable one. Both ways, the result is that they take up this weapon and no other. It follows that they have to play their role accordingly and abide by the rules of the game.

Satyāgraha is meant to hit the evil and not the evil-doer. This is an approach to the person's heart and understanding through self-suffering. The satyāgrahī considers it his business to convert the opponent to his point of view and not to destroy him. This is a corollary from the satyāgrahī's conviction that by self-suffering he can rouse the inner man in the opponent. It is a precondition of the satyāgrahī's activity that the opponent be peacefully converted. Never, never can satyāgraha contemplate violence to person or property. The essence of nonviolent resistance is the determination not to do or intend any harm or injury to the person of the opponent.

The same can generally be said about all property, though there might be exceptions in the case of property that is essentially and wholly harmful to society. Munitions and liquor may be said to be cases in point. Gandhi in his reply (15-7-1943) to *Congress Responsibility for Disturbances* in para 63 says: 'Nothing could be further from my thought than injury to the person or property of those who are manning and regulating the machinery of British Imperialism as it operates in India. My nonviolence draws a fundamental distinction between the man and his machine. I would destroy a harmful machine without compunction, never the man.'

Satyāgraha includes purification, suffering. The forms satyāgraha would take would be based on suffering, purification, penance, service and sacrifice. In the same way, a satyāgrahī is called upon to non-cooperate with evil. He claims to speak in the name of reason and has therefore the right to appeal to reason in every peaceful manner at the risk of suffering while doing so. He is bound to disobey laws that are repugnant to self-respect or justice or human conscience. Satyāgraha is nonviolent direct action. So in the course of asserting his right to go to a place or take charge of a thing such as untaxed salt, he is free to resort to peaceful direct action and suffer the consequences. If it

became impossible for a satyāgrahī to remain in a State with self-respect he may well abandon it and migrate. But he should under no circumstances flee from the place through fear. Finally he has the freedom to fast unto death. That may be said to be the brahmāstra, the final weapon, in a satyāgrahī's armoury. These are the different fountainheads, so to say, from which would flow the various forms of satyāgraha according to circumstances. Constructive work, meetings, processions, hartal, purificatory fast, prayer, non-cooperation, including no-tax, boycott, picketing, civil disobedience of laws, peaceful raids and marches, hijrat or migration, and fasts, are some of the recognized forms.

According to the three main categories of satyāgraha, its forms may be classified as constructive, purificatory and aggressive. All constructive activities, including the manifold constructive programme of Gandhi, are forms of constructive satyāgraha. Those forms belong to the stage of organization and preparation of satyāgraha when love takes the form of selfless service of society. Then there are hartāls, fasting, prayer and other self-denying actions which are cleansing or purificatory in effect. Withholding of voluntary cooperation with evil is also purificatory in its import. These forms of satyāgraha further qualify the satyāgrahī to take the next step. When the satyāgrahī takes the initiative in attacking the evil by a direct act of his own, such as a deliberate breach of law, it is called aggressive satyāgraha. He invites repression and suffering and is willing to die in the attempt to remove the evil.

The following are a few of the forms of satyāgraha, apart from the forms of constructive satyāgraha given in the Appendix.

1. Hartāl is a temporary strike of work and stopping of business, usually for 24 hours. It is a form of protest. It is prolonged if the cause is sufficiently serious and the wrong very great.

2. Fast (purificatory) is usually of 24 hours' duration. The day is to be spent in introspection and meditation.

3. Prayer is the invocation of higher spiritual forces for purifying and surrendering oneself to them.

4. Pledge is a solemn public declaration with God as witness, that a person would or would not do certain things.

5. Non-cooperation is a voluntary abstinence from cooperation with evil; for instance, if a government is supposed to be wholly evil, one should not give it any support or service, physical or moral. If it is supposed to be doing any particular evil act, one should not help

in that act. Naturally, non-cooperation with evil presupposes cooperation among the people who are non-cooperating.

6. Non-payment of taxes is the last step in non-cooperation. It is, in constitutional language, the refusal of supplies, not by a legislative vote but by direct action. One can cite the case of John Hampden refusing ship-money to Charles I. The Americans embodied the same principle in their slogan, 'No Taxation without Representation' in their War of Independence in 1776. Here the non-cooperator refuses to pay voluntarily the government dues and is willing to suffer the consequences.

7. Picketing is peaceful, courteous persuasion to do or not to do a certain thing. For instance, picketing at a liquor shop would mean sitting or standing nearby and appealing to every intending buyer not to buy. No trespass, crowding, physical obstruction or lying down on the ground is permissible.

8. Civil disobedience or civil resistance must be absolutely non-violent and without ill-will if it is to be called civil. It is open, non-violent defiance of any particular law. If such defiance is of an innoxious law newly imposed, it is defensive civil resistance. But if, in the course of direct nonviolent action, certain laws are defied as a symbol of revolt against the State it may be called aggressive civil disobedience.

9. Nonviolent raids or marches are forms of aggressive civil disobedience. They may be on salt depots as on Dharasana or anekatta in 1930 or on police stations as in Contai and Tamluk in 1942. But they must be absolutely open and nonviolent.

10. Hijrat is voluntary migration from the boundaries of a State. It is physical withdrawal from the State at the sacrifice of all interests.

11. Fasting unto death is voluntary abstention from food till death. It can never be absolute. It must be conditional. Otherwise it is suicide. It should never be undertaken lightly. In fact, Gandhi was very strict about it. It should never have a trace of coercion. It should not be undertaken only to change the opinions of others or to impose one's opinion on others. It should be the last weapon and life should have become absolutely intolerable before it is undertaken. These fasts are to be distinguished from purificatory fasts.

SATYĀGRAHA BY THE MASSES

Satyāgraha can be offered by an individual, a group, or a mass of people. When I use the word 'mass' I mean a whole community including women and children, combatants and non-combatants. A no-tax campaign is an instance of mass satyāgraha, as the whole lot of people in an area is involved, barring those few who might not be under an obligation to pay taxes. The South African campaign was a mass satyāgraha involving practically the whole Indian community residing there.

At this hour of day, it is idle to ask whether such an intricate and highly moral weapon like satyāgraha can be used by ignorant, illiterate, amorphous masses of men. It is now a matter of common knowledge and recorded history that it can be used, and often with success, not only by small groups in a well-defined area, but by vast masses constituting a whole nation. Besides the South African campaign and those of Bardoli and Siddapur or of Contai and Tamluk, the Satyāgraha on a nation-wide scale in India is a case in point. Is there anywhere else in the world a people so poor, so unlettered, so weak because ill-fed, and so meek as the masses of India? Nowhere else in the world is to be seen a greater variety of customs, languages, forms of religion and worship, than among the five hundred millions of India. And yet India with its 350 millions in those days was the scene of mass satyāgraha launched on various occasions during the years 1920-1942. The weapon was tried on an unprecedented scale and one can study the different aspects of the weapon. Every time the initiator was Gandhi and it was the same soulless, alien bureaucracy that was the opponent. Though there is scope for better organization and greater successes in the future, what has been achieved is enough to inspire faith in the new weapon of peaceful social change.

It was as early as in 1908 that Gandhi visualized the use of satyāgraha for all the ills in India. Reverend Doke writes : 'In view of the unrest at present (1908) so apparent in India, I invited him to send a message through these pages to the young men of his native land. His reply in writing lies before me: "... The struggle in the

Transvaal is not without its interest for India. We are engaged in raising men who will give a good account of themselves in any part of the world. We have undertaken the struggle on the following assumptions : Passive resistance is always infinitely superior to physical force. There is no inherent barrier between Europeans and Indians anywhere. Whatever may have been the motives of the rulers in India, there is a desire on the part of the nation at large to see that justice is done. Passive resistance, in connection with the Transvaal struggle, I should hold justifiable on the strength of any of these propositions. It may be a slow remedy, but I regard it is an absolutely sure remedy, not only for our ills in the Transvaal but for all the political and other troubles from which our people suffer in India.”

When Gandhi offered satyāgraha as a weapon to India, he said that it was a substitute for armed rebellion. He ventured to present it to the country emphasizing its civil resistance aspect. But the country as a whole had not adopted nonviolence as its creed. It followed satyāgraha as a policy, as a temporary, creed. Gandhi wrote (*Young India*, 7-5-1931): ‘Our nonviolence widespread though it be, good enough though it was for the purpose intended, it was not a nonviolence of the strong and knowing. It did not spring from living faith.’ In 1940 again he wrote (*Harijan*, 20 April): ‘We in India have never given nonviolence the trial it deserves. The marvel is that we have attained so much even with our mixed nonviolence.’ On 21 July 1940, he said; ‘Ahimsā is my special sādhanā (spiritual discipline) and not that of the Congress.’

All this clearly means, as Shri Kripalani bluntly put it, that satyāgraha as accepted by the Congress on behalf of the Indian nation was not a means of spiritual salvation or self-realization. It was direct action of nonviolent type for the redress of political and economic wrongs and injustices. It eschewed violence in politics on practical grounds. The satyāgraha that Congress had accepted was neither individual nor spiritual, but political, economic and collective. The Congress had accepted only the external, physical, and collective aspect of the weapon of satyāgraha.

But even that was enough for the masses to begin with. The experiment was in the process of making for about twenty-five years. The sixth of April 1919 saw the advent of satyāgraha in India on a nation-wide scale. Since then it had advanced from strength to strength and the nation became confident of winning its final goal

with the use of this matchless weapon.

Apart from many small campaigns for local purposes, the Congress launched or was involved in six all-India campaigns during the second quarter of the century. Altogether they lasted for six years, eight months and two days. I assume here that the last movement came to a stop on 5 May 1944. Out of that period, active and sustained resistance was maintained during four years and eleven months. Two of those campaigns were by selected individuals, the first from 6 to 18 April 1919 and the second from 17 October 1940 to 4 December 1941. All the other four were mass campaigns, and lakhs of men, women and children took part in them, observing the discipline of nonviolence in very trying circumstances with thousands of them suffering untold hardships. There was brutal violence on the part of the police and the military who used force freely. Instead of imprisoning people for breach of laws, Government used the lathi and bullet. Instead of arresting men and women for carrying a flag or contraband salt one saw policemen and sergeants twisting the tender wrists of the boys and girls for wresting the national flags or salt from their hands. Peaceful processions were stopped, cordoned off and ultimately dispersed with lathis wounding sometimes hundreds at a time. Still in ninety-nine cases out of hundred, there was not even a show of retaliation by the people. There have been stray cases of violence on the part of the people but not in organized programmes where the leaders and workers had chalked out plans beforehand. There was mob violence in some places either on account of fury or extreme provocation. But such outbreaks were always condemned by the leaders and controlled in time and the utmost care was taken to avoid a repetition of such incidents. It was easy to make much of such things and put them forth as a plea to crush the whole movement with a heavy hand or to brush aside the possibility of mass satyāgraha in a puristic spirit. But the aim of the satyāgrahī is neither to minimize nor to exaggerate violence on the part of the people. The satyāgrahī will sooner study the cases of violence and try to remove the causes and to educate the people not to resort to it than try to argue. Gandhi stopped the whole movement both in 1919 and 1922 when there was an outbreak of serious violence. But at the same time, he said firmly and clearly that satyāgraha was not the cause of violence but that, on the other hand, it was a restraining influence. If there had been no satyāgraha at that time, there would certainly have been much more violence,

Gandhi had long ago realized that violence was an unmixed evil and it had to be controlled whether it appeared within Congress ranks or in those of others. His appeal was not to physical might, but to moral right; not to violence but to reason; not to hatred and rage but to love. He wanted to settle things not on the battlefield; but at the talking table, not by the sword but by the pen and the tongue.

When that appeal to reason fails, Gandhi advises satyāgraha. 'My uniform experience is that true suffering melts the stoniest heart', says Gandhi. His faith in this method is reflected in another saying of his: 'Nothing can shake me from the conviction that, given a good cause, suffering for its sake advances it as nothing else had ever done.' In his speech at the Round Table Conference in London in 1931 he said: 'When your hearts have been touched (by the sufferings of India) will come the psychological moment for negotiation and not till then.'

Satyāgraha comes as the last and yet as the most potent of peaceful weapons. After all other remedies such as constitutional agitation etc. have been exhausted satyāgraha steps in. It exactly takes the place of violent direct action. It comes in where violence would have been resorted to in the ordinary course if those in command were to follow the usual methods of resistance and fighting. The dissatisfaction, the tempo of resentment, the degree of desperation, and the inevitability of using the last remedy are the same in satyāgraha as in the case of violent resistance. Gandhi claimed that he had turned the utter wrath of the people from the enemy and made it flow into acts that invited suffering on themselves. When he was blamed and criticized for introducing this new weapon in South Africa, he defended himself saying: 'If the natives in any crisis adopt this method meeting what they believe to be injustice, rather than resort to force, we ought to be devoutly thankful. It would mean that the gun and the assegai would give place to peaceful tactics. . . . When the moment of collision comes, if instead of the old ways of massacre, assegai and fire the natives adopt the policy of passive resistance, it will be a grand change for the colony.' During the days of the Rowlatt Act agitation Gandhi felt that it would 'run into violent channels' if no definite direction was given. He said on 20 March 1919: 'We hope to wean that party from the suicidal method of violence.' To the Hunter Committee he said (*Young India*, 5-11-1919): 'It is a movement intended to replace methods of violence and a movement entirely based on truth.' When speaking of a remedy against

a government that was using law itself for suppressing its subjects and had thus become lawless, Gandhi said (*Young India*, 17-11-1921) that in such a case 'Civil disobedience becomes a sacred duty. . . . Another remedy there certainly is, and that is armed revolt. Civil disobedience is a complete, effective and bloodless substitute.' He since then emphasized that it was an effective substitute for armed rebellion and that it was conceived as such (*Harijan*, 15-4-1933). On 15 July 1943, in his reply to *Congress Responsibility for Disturbances*, Gandhi said: 'The accumulated experiences of the last thirty-eight years, the first of which were in South Africa, fills me with the greatest hope that in the adoption of nonviolence lies the future of India and the world. It is the most harmless and yet equally effective way of dealing with the political and economic wrongs of the down-trodden portion of humanity.'

In fact, if Gandhi had not been there to guide and lead India, awakened and conscious as she was, she would certainly have adopted the usual methods of armed revolt against her alien oppressors. The method would have been barbarous and bloody, the cost enormous, the path tortuous. But it would have been inevitable, because what great country so vast and heroic, with such a noble past and a promising future would reconcile itself to eternal slavery, and lend itself to ruthless and shameless exploitation? It was bound to rise and make a bid for independence. A choice had to be made and at the psychological moment Gandhi presented this unique weapon of satyāgraha. But the rulers did not take kindly to this weapon. No tyrant worth the name is tolerant of any movement on the part of his slaves! Gandhi in his speech at the Round Table Conference in 1931 said: 'The Congress then comes upon the scene and devises a new method not known to history, namely, that of civil disobedience, and the Congress has been following that method up. But again I am up against a stone wall and I am told that it is a method that no government in the world will tolerate! Well, of course, the Government may not tolerate, no government has tolerated open rebellion.' At the same time, in absolute self-confidence he continues: 'No government may tolerate civil disobedience, but governments have to succumb even to these forces, as the British Government has done before now, even as the great Dutch Government after eight years of trial had to yield to the logic of facts. General Smuts is a brave general, a great statesman, and a very hard taskmaster also. But he himself recoiled with horror from even the contemplation of doing to death innocent

men and women who were merely fighting for the preservation of their self-respect, and the things which he had vowed he would never yield in 1908, reinforced as he was by General Botha, he had to yield in the year 1914 after having tried these civil resisters through and through. And in India Lord Chelmsford had to do the same thing; the Governor of Bombay had to do the same thing in Borsad and Bardoli.'

Thus mass satyāgraha is no longer a novelty nor an unknown weapon, nor is it a voyage upon uncharted seas. Even in 1919 (*Young India*, 5 November) Gandhi said: 'In my opinion, the beauty and efficacy of satyāgraha are so great and the doctrine so simple that it can be preached even to children. It was preached by me to thousands of men, women and children commonly called indentured Indians (in South Africa) with excellent results.' Again, he wrote (*Young India*, 10-3-1920): 'And whether one takes the satyāgraha pledge or not, there can be no doubt that the spirit of satyāgraha has pervaded the masses.' A vigilant, scientific and successful application of satyāgraha in all fields of life for an unbroken period of at least fifty years has confirmed Gandhi in his opinion that masses are amenable to discipline and can wield the weapon in an effective manner. He would assert: 'There is no *prima facie* reason why under nonviolence the mass, if disciplined, should be incapable of showing the discipline which in organized warfare a fighting force normally does.' No doubt he was not fully satisfied with the degree of nonviolence imbibed by the masses. But that only means that there is necessity and scope for further improvement and for better mass education along those lines. There is no question about the practicability, advisability, and efficacy of mass satyāgraha. It can be used not only to combat local grievances, but can be taken up for the emancipation of a whole nation from degradation or slavery. In fact, it is the only weapon, if the other, namely armed revolt, is not to be resorted to.

CHAPTER 13

MORAL EQUIVALENT FOR WAR

It is one thing to say that war is a necessary evil, but quite another to assert that it is a boon to humanity. However romantic might have been the wars of ancient times, today with the invention of deadly explosives, rockets, atomic bombs and ballistic missiles, and with the advent of organization for total war, their destructive capacity has increased a million-fold.

It is said that war brings into bold relief virtues like sacrifice, courage and unselfishness; but if virtue is to exhibit itself only when there is an orgy of vice, sin and brutality all round, one would rather like to forgo such an excruciating and agonising exhibition.

It is a sad fact that war is an institution which is as old as humanity. But man has been trying to avoid it and even now takes to it only as the last resort. He has also been trying to humanize it in various ways. In spite of the popular saying that 'everything is fair in love and war', humanity has attempted to introduce an amount of fairness in it by hedging it with some 'rules of the game'. International laws, like the Geneva Convention and the Red Cross regulations, try to lessen its severity.

There is certainly a conflict in nature on all planes of existence, physical, mental, moral and spiritual. But the question is whether these conflicts are always to be decided only by war, that is by an appeal to might and violence. A more important question is whether man is to consider war to be either inevitable, desirable, or the only mode of solving clashes of interest between nations. Is brute force to be the final arbiter in human affairs? Has that been the trend of civilisation? Certainly not. Man swears by his higher nature and his progress is to be measured only by the extent to which his higher nature, which stands for reason, justice, peace, fairness and love expresses itself.

This is exactly what Gandhi stresses when he says (*Young India*, 2-3-1928): 'Man does not live by destruction. Self-love compels regard for others. Nations cohere because there is mutual regard among the individuals composing them. Some day we must extend the national law to the universe, even as we have extended the family

law to form nations—a larger family.’

If then we agree that might is not always right, and that at least in human affairs right and justice must prevail, how crude, barbarous and unsatisfactory is the way of war to solve the clash of interests and the conflict of wills, which are inevitable in one form or another even under the most ideal conditions? In the first place, those who are right might not be physically strong enough to enforce their right. Then the use of violence creates hatred and gives rise to the spirit of vengeance, which rather than concentrating our attention on justice, helps to perpetuate the use of violence without solving the problem. Moreover, war generates excitement and passion, with the result that both parties in the dispute lose their balance of mind and are not in a position to think calmly on the issues at stake. War is likely to destroy the very interests which each party wishes to save. The best and bravest on both sides often succumb, leaving second-rate men to solve the problems. Death to the brave and a lease of life to the cowards is often the result. Violence aims at coercing the other party. This coercion can never be successful and real interests are not served by such coercion. And even if there is victory, it is often nominal and full advantage cannot be taken of it. In modern wars destruction on both sides is so terrible that the victor and the vanquished are reduced to the same plight.

Thus, even assuming that war brings to the fore certain great qualities in man and puts his energies to the test, it cannot be recommended as a permanent or satisfactory solution. Other ways and means have to be found. That is why, William James came out with a plea as early as 1910 for finding a moral equivalent of war. He would like that equivalent to be more satisfactory as a solution of conflicts and at the same time as stimulating, as invigorating, and as conducive to great virtues as war itself. Is not satyāgraha such a moral equivalent? I would answer that it is not only an equivalent but a thing far superior to violence and violent resistance. Satyāgraha has none of the disadvantages of war; as a matter of fact, it has many advantages over war. It can seldom be abused; it would reduce the temptation to wage war if physically weaker people learn this art. All this can be demonstrated by a detailed comparison of war and satyāgraha.

War is an attempt to decide claims which are otherwise irreconcilable. What can be the moral substitute for this physical and therefore unethical method except satyāgraha which is at once nonviolent

and ethical and appeals to the head through the heart? It claims to settle the battle of interests and wills provided the cause is right and just. It does not inflict suffering on others and does not involve destruction of anything essentially useful to humanity. It does not inflict pain and does not act through fear. It appeals through self-suffering to the heart and to the sense of fairness and justice. It calls for the highest virtues of sacrifice, love and suffering bravery. It appeals successfully or dies in the attempt. Thus it tries to decide things, which could not be decided in any other way, finally. It is moral in that it does not involve violence, and appeals to reason through emotion and tries to arouse the conscience and the ethical sense.

There is no doubt that 'good men' all over the world are sick of war. The pacifists, the conscientious objectors, the internationalists, the satyāgrahīs are all against war. But it is not enough to be against war. As Walter Lippman says, '... disputes have to be decided and a way of deciding them must be found which is not war'. Lippman adds: 'It is not sufficient to propose an equivalent for the military virtues. It is even more important to work out an equivalent for the military methods and objectives. For the institution of war is not merely an expression of the military spirit. It is not a mere release of certain subjective impulses clamouring for expression. It is also—and I think primarily—one of the ways by which great human decisions are made. If that is true, then the abolition of war depends primarily upon inventing and organising other ways of deciding those issues which have been hitherto decided by war.'

It can be claimed that satyāgraha helps to arrive at great decisions in a way far superior to that of violent war.

Let us see the similarities and the differences between war and satyāgraha. First the similarities. Both are resorted to as a last recourse. Both are forms of direct action. (Gandhi wrote as early as on 12 May 1920 in *Young India*, that 'never has anything been done on this earth without direct action. . . . It was direct action in South Africa which told and told so effectively that it converted General Smuts to sanity. . . . In Champaran it was direct action which removed an age-long grievance.') Both have to stake all in conducting the respective campaigns. Both call forth bravery, heroism, the spirit of adventure and romance, capacity to endure suffering, self-control, self-sacrifice, chivalry and dynamic action. Both are methods of settling great disputes and, therefore, have a compelling element in them. War aims at coercion and compulsion through physical force.

Satyāgraha aims at conversion by a change of heart. But in case it fails to do that, it compels through moral pressure. Both aim at demoralizing the enemy each in its own way, one by inspiring fear through infliction of pain, the other by making him feel through self-suffering that he is in the wrong. Both require great discipline and much preparation. Both invoke the spirit of sacrifice for a great cause and thus pave the way to glory.

While these are the points of similarity, the points of difference are many and very important. War uses physical force, satyāgraha uses moral force. War stands for violence, for destruction of person and property, and for annihilation of the opponent or his humiliating submission; satyāgraha stands for nonviolence and non-injury to person and property, supports the principle of live and let live, and does not wish to humiliate the opponent but would treat him as an equal. War inflicts the highest suffering, satyāgraha invites the utmost suffering. War appeals to might, while an appeal to reason is the *sine qua non* of satyāgraha. Very heavy losses are often the result of war; the comparative losses in men and money in satyāgraha campaigns are light. War as an institution does not stand for compromise; satyāgraha always admits compromise on non-essentials. War necessarily engenders hatred, anger and the spirit of revenge; satyāgraha promotes love, compassion and pity. War is likely to support an unjust cause; satyāgraha can never do it. War envisages secrecy, distrust, falsehood, espionage and diplomacy; satyāgraha is based on truth and always uses open and straightforward methods. War excites feelings of rage and fury; satyāgraha exhorts people to be calm and forbearing without any ill-will towards anybody. War is a barbarous method; satyāgraha may be called a civilized and a Christian method. Organization for war and organization for satyāgraha have very important repercussions on society. While the country that prepares for war pours its treasure for the manufacture of munitions and calls on its men to be ready to shoot down their brethren in the neighbouring country, the country preparing for satyāgraha would promote the highest goodwill and the feeling of brotherhood. It would prepare for suffering rather than for inflicting injury.

War pays no regard to the relation between the means and ends, while in satyāgraha the means-ends nexus is quite consistent, constant and continuous. Those who wage wars, especially aggressive wars, are dogmatic about their aims, while a satyāgrahī is never so. He always thinks that the other man's view may be right and therefore

he does not wish to impose suffering on him but is willing to suffer himself. War leaves behind a legacy of bitterness, hatred, revenge and seeds of future wars while after satyāgraha no such bitter memories remain. A satyāgrahī has no interest in keeping such memories alive, since he never wishes to act upon them. Gandhi wrote on 12 May 1920, in *Young India*: 'But what is more, direct action sustained for eight years left behind it not only no bitterness, but the very Indians who put up such a stubborn fight against General Smuts ranged themselves round his banner in 1915 and fought under him in East Africa.' In the case of war one requires immense and varied material resources. What is wanted in satyāgraha is the human material itself and possibly in far fewer numbers than is needed in a violent war.

The author of the *Dawn of Freedom in India* sums up the position as follows: 'Satyāgraha, unlike war, does not demoralise the combatants. Rather it ennobles those on both sides. I am ready to believe that the police who conducted lathi-charges in Bombay are better men today than they were a year ago. Their victims certainly are. I have stayed in some of the "War Camps" of Gujarat; I could not help comparing them with the camps described in *All Quiet on the Western Front*. On the one side frantic hysteria to the breaking point; on the other, calm and lofty equipoise. There was drunken valour; here valorous temperance. There was foul language and sordid ideas; here was the very spirit of religion. In Europe, men were being degraded to the level of beasts; in India they were being raised to the highest levels to which humanity can rise.

'Satyāgraha has all the romance and adventurousness of war. It has the element of risk, and not a few are called to lay down their lives. It is, I think, a nobler bravery, a bravery of the soul, which the satyāgrahī is called to.

'It is economical. It does not involve a huge outlay in weapons, barracks and pensions. It is a warfare of ascetics, fit child of a nation which is preeminently the mother of ascetics. It is an expression of the democratic spirit; it bestows no titles, no decorations; it does away with all class-distinction. Its warriors may be recruited from every walk of life and even women and children can play their part in it. Its possibilities are infinite; there is no situation in which it cannot be applied.'

Quoting Gandhi he adds, 'It is an all-sided sword; it can be used anyhow; it blesses him who uses it and him against whom it is

used. Without drawing a drop of blood, it produces far-reaching results. It never rusts and cannot be stolen.” ’

By now satyāgraha has been used practically in all fields and on all occasions except during an invasion by an armed enemy. In all other matters it has proved a good substitute for violence and war. India fighting for freedom with this weapon against her alien oppressors who were armed to the teeth has been a very great experiment. It was destined to succeed and has inspired confidence in its efficacy. Stemming the tide of invasion and resisting successfully an advancing enemy would certainly require preparations on an enormous scale and freedom to organize along that direction. But it is not beyond the scope of satyāgraha to do it.

There are other schools of thought which oppose the institution of war, but they have not proved as effective as satyāgraha. The pacifists oppose all wars, but having no alternative, they are either reduced to inaction in times of crisis or they begin to support war. That was what happened to eminent pacifists like Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein, A.A. Milne and Beverley Nichols during World War II. A counsel of negation can never succeed in the field of action. There are the conscientious objectors. Theirs is an individual solution. It satisfies the individual conscience for the time being but does not carry us farther. There are the ‘internationalists’ who have faith in some kind of federation and in a league of nations. But those things have been tried and they have been found wanting. Moreover they too ultimately depend upon the sanction of force. All these schools of thought miss a basic point. So far as internal problems are concerned, no constitution provides for a fundamental change and that too against itself. Therefore when a fundamental change is to be brought about nothing can avail but direct action, either violent or nonviolent. In the same way, when two nations are in conflict, no decision can be reached except through direct action, violent or nonviolent. Thus direct action, taking the law into one’s own hands, is a necessity. On this point what Gandhi said in December 1932, when he issued a statement about his fast, is relevant. He declared that no radical change in society was possible without raising a ferment. That could be done only by either of the two methods, by violence or nonviolence. Violence was to be eschewed because it was degrading and depressing. Nonviolence was ennobling and it touched and strengthened the moral fibre even of those against whom it was directed.

Thus if a real way is to be found out to avoid war and yet to find a solution to social conflicts there seems to be no way but to organize society on the lines of satyāgraha.

Aldous Huxley rightly says that all want peace but none is willing to work for the things which would bring peace. Peace would not come by an increase in armaments, by aggressive nationalism and patriotism based on hatred. Peace would not come by cultivating individually the doctrine of non-resistance and finding an individual solution. Peace would not come even by passive resistance because it can be offered only when there is some aggression by another. What is required is aggressive nonviolent direct action and an all-out attack on evil. That is the role of satyāgraha in its ultimate end. It includes non-resistance and passive resistance but goes far beyond. It would not rest till all evil is wiped out of existence. A satyāgrah may begin humbly and at home. But the ultimate ambition of satyāgraha as a way of life and as a social weapon is to wage relentless war against all evil and establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. 'Peace and goodwill unto men' is its moving message.

CHAPTER 14

TOWARDS NO-WAR

Satyāgraha is a vast subject. But the specific question we have to deal with here is, whether satyāgraha as evolved, preached and practised by Gandhi in his own life time (1869-1948) in South Africa and India, or any modification thereof, can serve as an alternative to violence and war; whether it can solve conflicts, national and international, which are today sought to be solved by violence; whether the underlying principles and technique of satyāgraha can force nations to turn a new page and make them divert human energies and natural resources from war to progressive peaceful activities; in short, whether it can work the miracle of beating swords into ploughshares.

Soon after Hiroshima, Gandhi said: 'The atomic bomb has deadened the finest feeling that has sustained mankind for ages. Now we know the naked truth about war. War knows no law except might. The moral to be legitimately drawn from the supreme tragedy of the bomb is that it will not be destroyed by counter-bombs even as violence cannot be by counter-violence.'

As early as 1914 he had declared his faith in the efficacy of satyāgraha in the 'Golden Number' of *Indian Opinion*: 'Satyāgraha is a force which, if it becomes universal, would revolutionise social ideas and do away with despotism and the evergrowing militarism under which the nations of the West are groaning and are being almost crushed to death, and which fairly promises to overwhelm even the nations of the East.'

Before taking up the problem, it seems necessary to know and understand clearly what satyāgraha means and what are its fundamentals according to Gandhi. He coined this expression in 1906 in South Africa to distinguish his own method of fighting all evil, injustice and tyranny, from what is commonly called 'passive resistance'. The particular form of evil he was faced with in South Africa was racial discrimination; in India it was the political domination of Britain.

Satyāgraha (satya+āgraha) has come to mean a determined adherence to the truth of one's own perception, and if opposed, readiness to suffer for it even unto death, without any ill-will against the

rong-doer. This can be practised, both by individuals and by groups, as a way of life as well as for solving conflicts of interests.

It may be noted here that Gandhi's outlook on life was scientific and he always thought in terms of forces operating in human affairs and human progress. The title he gave to his autobiography was deliberate. He called it 'My Experiments with Truth'. Truth for him meant not merely abstract reality but the truth of life, the truth of experience, the truth in terms of human values above all. He saw 'truth' in all religions and emphasised to the utmost the common factor of ethical conduct. His principles and practice of satyāgraha were derived from his faith in truth and nonviolence or love as the greatest promotive and formative forces in social change and the evolution of humanity. That is why, irrespective of caste, creed and religion, satyāgraha could be practised in various contexts by millions of Hindus and Moslems and Christians; and it became a powerful weapon in the hands of the great Pathan leader, Badshah Khan of the then Frontier Province.

In 1914 he wrote in *Indian Opinion*, his weekly journal, as follows:

The term passive resistance does not fit the activity of the Indian community during the past eight years. Its equivalent in the vernacular (satyāgraha), rendered into English, means truth-force. I think Tolstoy called it also soul-force or love-force, and so it is. Carried out to its utmost limits, this force is independent of pecuniary or other material assistance; certainly, even in its elementary form, of physical force or violence. Indeed, violence is the negation of this great spiritual force; it can only be cultivated or wielded by those who will entirely eschew violence. It is a force that may be used as well in political as in domestic affairs. Its universal applicability is a demonstration of its permanence and invincibility. It can be used alike by men, women and children. It is totally untrue to say that it is a force to be used only by the weak so long as they are not capable of meeting violence by violence. This superstition arises from the incompleteness of the English expression. It is impossible for those who consider themselves to be weak to apply this force. Only those who realise that there is something in man which is superior to the brute-nature in him, and that the latter always gives in, can effectively be passive resisters (satyāgrahīs). This force is to violence and, therefore, to all tyranny, all injustice, what light is to

darkness. In politics its use is based upon the immutable maxim that government of the people is possible only so long as they consent either consciously or unconsciously to be governed.

To Gandhi, positive love and nonviolence was the law of human evolution. Satyāgraha to him was a way of life and not merely a means to any particular 'ends'. To him the means-ends relation was vital and organic. As the means, so the ends. To use always and only the right means is the highest 'end', according to Gandhi.

It is in this context that Gene Sharp observes: 'Satyāgraha, as a concrete expression of the principle of moral approximation of the ends and means relationship, can be regarded as the most unique contribution to the philosophy and technique of revolution in our time.' In fact, satyāgraha seeks to create a new relationship between conflicting parties by inviting the opponent to fight the conflict-situation rather than fight each other. Gandhi always described himself as an humble seeker after truth. He was ever conscious that man was liable to err and therefore would not impose by force 'his truth' on others. He would, however, try to establish his truth even by aggressive nonviolent action, and suffer the consequences joyfully even unto death, in the confident hope of converting the opponent to his view. In his article, 'To Every Briton', he declared his faith as follows: 'I have been practising with scientific precision, nonviolence and its possibilities for an unbroken period of over fifty years. I have applied it in every walk of life—domestic, institutional, economic, and political.'

Even so, we cannot say that Gandhi had occasion to try his technique in all conceivable situations. Nuclear tests and nuclear war have added to the difficulties of applying this technique in an effective way, as remote-control and unreachable mechanical devices instead of human beings are involved.

It is necessary to remember that while satyāgraha, realisation of truth through nonviolence, was the creed of Gandhi, many have sought to use the technique only as a weapon for securing certain rights. These two attitudes differ fundamentally as already pointed out by Gandhi. As an illustration of the two attitudes, one of a satyāgrahī for whom satyāgraha is a permanent principle, and another of one for whom it is a policy, I am giving below two extracts from *Passive Resistance in South Africa* by Leo Kuper.

These are the words of a leader for whom satyāgraha is a way of life: 'The weapons we are to use will be stronger than the atomic

bomb. I hope you understand that weapon. A just and righteous rule will be established. By suffering we shall march forward with this weapon.'

The words below are of one for whom satyāgraha is only a policy: 'If in this country violence is to come we shall not allow the White man to tell us where the battlefield will be. The White man will not choose the time. I say if violence must come, the African will choose the time and the battlefield. But I repeat, violence is not contemplated. We say this campaign is going to be peaceful.'

Anyway, it is of primary importance to realise that even a policy, when adopted, is a principle and a creed for the time being. A policy is a temporary principle, and a principle is a permanent policy.

When Gandhi declared that love, nonviolence is the law of the human species, and that human progress towards peace, joy and fulfilment is the ideal, he placed himself in the forefront of the human evolutionary urge. Satyāgraha became his life-breath and he turned into a champion fighter against all anti-evolutionary forces including war. Romain Rolland has characterised him as follows: 'No one has a greater horror of passivity than this tireless fighter who is one of the most heroic incarnations of a man who resists. The soul of his movement is active force of love, faith and sacrifice.'

It cannot be said that satyāgraha is quite a new thing. It may be said to be as old as the saints, since they did live a life of truth, love and sacrifice. But what is significant is that Gandhi developed a technique which could be applied on a mass scale in all fields of human activity and to solve all kinds of conflicts. It is this that has opened new vistas and inspired in mankind a new hope that this may be helpful as a moral equivalent of war.

The peace-lovers, the conscientious objectors, the pacifists, the internationalists, one-worlders and many others are sincerely trying to find a way out. While they are all clear about the end they want to reach, their 'means' hardly touch the fringe of the problem. None of them seem to have struck on a technique which can release non-violent human energies on a mass scale to match the violent tendencies, and ultimately evolve a peace-loving comity of nations.

In this context, can satyāgraha indicate the right direction, if not lead us the whole way?

The fact of the matter is that satyāgraha is not a mechanical formula nor a mathematical theory. It is a living, dynamic principle and philosophy of life which is yet to evolve and unfold itself fully.

It has yet to replace effectively the operation of physical force and coercion in social evolution and social dynamics. Love, nonviolence is the law of our species, no doubt; but it has yet to establish itself firmly and fully. Nevertheless it is progressively advancing. It is struggling, with reason as its helpmate, to control the irrational urges of present-day humanity.

Gandhi and the satyāgraha he has evolved show us the lines along which man can revolutionise human society and bring in the era of love, friendliness and cooperation. It was perhaps an accident of history that he was born in India. He never based the principles of satyāgraha and action on any particular religion of faith. Satyāgraha is ethical human behaviour based on truth and love and is operated on the strength of psychological principles. It is well known that Gandhi had followers from all religions, and now satyagraha has become the property of all human beings throughout the world.

It is doubtful if organised political states as such will ever entertain a plan of action based on the principles of satyāgraha. Because every state is founded on physical force as its basic and final sanction.

So to expect even the smallest state to think in terms of the principles of satyāgraha is to live in an imaginary world. It is equally futile to expect even the biggest state, which swears by peace, to cease to add to its striking power. 'Keeping the powder dry' is the only policy that all states follow. A state which would train and discipline its citizens in the science and art of satyāgraha is yet to be born. Even India, which won its freedom by predominantly nonviolent means, has not been able, as a state, to do anything either in the way of unilateral disarmament or in the way of organising a 'nonviolent army' for international purposes.

Nevertheless such states as are not out for war, such as are peace-minded, and such as are in dead earnest to see that the ways of peace and friendliness are ultimately substituted for those of war and violence, can help create circumstances which can promote the methods of satyāgraha by the people. They can certainly add to the common efforts of mankind to bring about an atmosphere of peace.

The first and most important step that a state can take, therefore, in lessening the tension and chances of war, I mean a major war, is to refrain from joining the power-groups or power-blocs, as they are called. This is a kind of 'non-cooperation with evil'. It might be that in the beginning such states as stand aloof from the blocs would

feel isolated. It might be that, as and when the moral rightness of this small step is realised, more and more states would join the group of those who refrained from joining power-blocs, and in time the major powers which are preparing for war and piling up weapons would themselves be isolated. Complete non-cooperation, boycott, and education of public opinion within the borders of the war-mongering states might then follow from a sufficiently well-organised group of states which have deliberately and on principle stood out of power-blocs. They might insist that there should be complete disarmament, that there should be no war henceforward and that means and methods other than violence and war should be brought into use, both for preventing international conflicts and for solving them.

In the above paragraphs, I have dealt with the nonviolent action which non-aligned states can take and try to create an atmosphere for the use of only peaceful methods to solve conflicts between state and state. It should be remembered in this context that the pressure sought to be applied is moral and nonviolent. Therefore its strength and effect will depend upon the moral status of the states which combine to act. They must be such as have pledged themselves to peace, have no territorial ambitions, have no selfish motives and have no lust for power. Now let me explore the more important technique which may be adopted by individual citizens for total abolition of war and violence as means for solving international conflicts.

It may be noted that we are not concerned here with conflicts between individuals or groups within a nation. It is only with international conflicts that we are dealing. Even so, it is ultimately only earnest individuals, who have felt and realised the urgency of finding a substitute for violence and war, who would think and act. Even in the non-aligned states, it is such individuals who would lead the states to take the course mentioned in the paragraphs above. Much more so would be the case when we are considering how individuals, convinced of the guilt and the catastrophic nature of war and violence can and should organise a drive for substituting nonviolent ways for solving international conflicts.

To begin with, we must realise that though this is an international mission, it has to be carried on by individuals in all states, possibly against restrictions, opposition and even repression, and that the real results would be long in coming; we must therefore not only have patience, but also the faith that one step is enough for the time

being and that good means will certainly lead to good ends, if not today then tomorrow and the day after. Gandhi once wrote that infinite patience is the very hall-mark and test of faith. A tremendous moral force has to be built up before anything tangible and effective can be undertaken.

This moral force has to be built up by selfless service of the people amongst whom we live and move. Intellectual education and propagation alone cannot go far enough in building up a moral potential. That has to come from strength of character and selfless service and sacrifice. Here, we have to recollect Gandhi's 'constructive programme' as he called it. It consisted of every kind of service rendered to the people round about, without expectation of any return. The service might take the shape of the simplest and the humblest of actions, such as cleaning the premises, or it might take that of bestowing the highest spiritual knowledge. It is only the moral force a peacemaker builds around himself which is available to him for carrying out the mission he takes upon himself. The satyāgrahī must be able to make a permanent impact on those amidst whom he lives or works. When he takes action as a satyāgrahī, he should be able to have full moral support and the unquestioned following of those to whom he has endeared himself.

Today it is a well-known fact that the world is war-weary, that while the governments are preparing for war, the people not only do not want war but definitely want peace. But at the same time they are afraid of aggression, of being conquered by 'others', by foreigners; they are afraid of losing their freedom. It is for this reason that they allow their governments to prepare for war even while they themselves hanker for peace. They realise that at best war is a counsel of despair and at worst an invitation to death and destruction. In one sense the situation is very hopeful. The helplessness which is seen everywhere is due mainly to the fact that evil is better organised than goodness and virtue. Since nobody wants violence to triumph, if only we know how to organise nonviolent and peaceful forces in our own country and in the world, there is every hope that the violent war machinery would break down.

When such is the situation, it is the moral duty of every individual and every citizen to line himself upon the side of 'no-war' and see that he supports by some intelligent and firm action the organisation of nonviolent force. Mere sentimental revulsion from war is not very helpful. Mere lip-sympathy or intellectual appreciation of

peace efforts is no longer enough. There has to be in each country a vast army of disciplined and organised peace-lovers who have built up around themselves moral force through their character, sincerity of purpose, and selfless service of the people. It is such an army of peaceful citizens alone which can convince the governments concerned that war and violence are superfluous and that they are not only costly but fatal games which would destroy humanity.

The basic need of various peace movements today, by whatever name they might be called, is an organised and dedicated army of workers in all countries, of the type of satyāgrahīs who enrolled themselves under Gandhi's leadership in India. The next step can be taken only when there is such an army to take the step. The quality of the army is of much greater importance than its size. Today there are enough people, and many of them are very eminent, who are expressing strong opinions in favour of peace and peaceful methods, but there are only a handful who are ready to act and sacrifice their all for the purpose.

The time for action has come and when there is an army of men and women which is willing to act, the technique of international action may be found along the lines of 'satyāgraha'. This would include passive as well as aggressive nonviolent resistance to all those agencies which today directly or indirectly promote war and violence in the various states. Of course, such resistance should start only after all other types of persuasion have failed. The agencies of war preparations and the states themselves should be fully informed about the resistance and the form it is going to take; and the public in general should be apprised of the whole procedure. The preparations for such resistance should be quite open and fearless and those who take part should be ready to suffer cheerfully the logical and legal consequences.

Such resistance may take any form from simple non-cooperation to aggressive picketing even at the risk of being shot. It may include non-payment of taxes, boycott, social boycott of people who are directly manufacturing weapons of destruction, and so on. All these would depend upon the circumstances and the skill and tact of the local leaders. But under any circumstances, nonviolence has to be strictly adhered to and the distinction between the evil and the evil-doer has to be scrupulously borne in mind. There should be the readiness to suffer cheerfully the highest punishment and death in the buoyant faith that truth, in this case the cause of nonviolence,

will triumph. This is a nonviolent war against war and all the courage to face the worst has to be there. That is the true spirit of satyāgraha—it is the weapon of the brave against all evil.

Let me now close with two quotations, both comparatively old but very relevant. Let me also say that the West has awakened to the significance of satyāgraha and now it is not a question of East or West but of the whole of humanity organising the forces of love to defeat the forces of hate and evil:

Some day perhaps the people of the West will realise the significance of what has happened and will learn from the East to apply the methods of the Cross to the solving of their own great problems, especially the problem of international warfare. But at present, it is to be feared, we are too comfortable, too well-off, too well-fed. At present Satyāgraha is looked upon in the West, in spite of the astounding victory which it has won, as ridiculous and undignified. Working class hearers, when told about it, characterise it as 'grown-ups' sulks'. More educated audiences regard it with cold disfavour. It is too exotic, too unconventional—in a word, too Christian for us. But some day we shall awaken to the significance of what has happened and begin to be Christian again—that is, to leave all and work by the Cross. (*The Cross Moves East* by John S. Hoyland)

What has not yet been found in the West is a moral genius of such commanding spiritual personality as to be able to unite and combine the various organised efforts (for world peace) into one overwhelming movement of nonviolence which shall be strong enough to sweep away, on the tide of world approval, the opposing forces.

God send us that personality before it is too late. (*Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas* by C.F. Andrews)

CHAPTER 15

SATYĀGRAHA—ITS FUTURE

To speak about the future of Satyāgraha may be a journey into the regions of speculation, but it is not an idle or useless job. Those who think about the future of humanity have also to think about the way humanity will decide its disputes. A human community without wars is the only hope of survival for mankind, but it may yet take centuries before such an order comes into being.

Mahāvīra, Buddha, Jesus and many other saints have come and gone. They preached the doctrine of non-injury, of love. They have profoundly influenced humanity by setting up high ideals. Two thousand years have rolled away. And yet what do we find today? There are, no doubt, individuals here and there inspired by the highest ideals of love and charity, but beyond their personal lives, they often seem to be powerless in substantially moulding group-life or social life. The ultimate sanction in group-life and social conflicts is still violence. Even if negotiations and arbitration seem to succeed many times, they do so because of the fear of war and destruction, rather than as a result of reason or love of peace.

It is in a world like this that Gandhi passionately pleaded for the abolition of all violence and duplicity in the affairs of men and nations. He declared with uncompromising firmness that if truth and nonviolence were good for the individual, they were good for the group as well. He went further than Tolstoy and all others in this field by demonstrating the working of nonviolence in social conflicts of great magnitude.

Truth was his greatest love. He called Truth his God. He saw no safer and better approach to it than through innocence, nonviolence, love. This arose out of his perception of the truth that 'all life is one'. Moreover, he argued, erring mortal as man is, he ought not to be dogmatic about the truth he sees. If others see the same truth in the same way as one sees it, then what other things can make their relation sweeter than love? But even when others do not see eye to eye with him, the lover of truth fights a winning battle if he takes to the path of love and suffering and refuses to force it down the throat of others by infliction of pain. He does not merely meditate on love or

nonviolence but lives it. His love translates itself into service, suffering and sacrifice for others. His love does not stop at saying, 'Love thy neighbour as thyself'. It goes beyond that and makes him look upon all creatures as his neighbours and makes him love the neighbour more than himself. He would not perhaps die for himself because that would take away the very motive for dying. But he would die for others. Thus his life becomes consecrated in the pursuit of truth through loving service and sacrifice with goodwill unto all.

Out of this kind of life of Gandhi arose the doctrine of satyāgraha, the doctrine which seeks to solve social conflicts through self-suffering. For the first time he applied what is called Christian ethics by European writers to public affairs and political conflicts. Whether the Christian masters in Africa and India appreciated it or not, he stuck to his methods to the last. Will Durant in his *Case for India* says: 'The Indian situation represents the most extensive efforts ever made to test the practicability of Christianity. If India should succeed, the stock of Christianity (by which we mean the ethical ideals of Christ) would rise throughout the world; courtesy and peace would be in good repute unparalleled.' For an unbroken period of twentyfive years Gandhi used the same weapon for the solution of the Indian problem—the attainment of her freedom.

Even before India attained success in achieving her objective of Svarāj, through the use of satyāgraha she travelled a long way towards it. Satyāgraha achieved many a signal and unqualified success in fighting local wrongs, some of them very old and obstinate.

Some who speak with doubt and hesitation seem to think that once Gandhi was removed from the scene, satyāgraha had no future. It was his immense faith, his remarkable personality that had been responsible for the success of satyāgraha, they would say. It is to a great extent true that his personality was the base on which satyāgraha stood for years. But at the same time, the stature his personality attained was itself due to his having been a staunch satyāgrahī. It was not Gandhi who made satyāgraha but it was satyāgraha which made Gandhi. His personality was not something separate and foreign to satyāgraha. It will not be right to say that Gandhi was, as it were, a patron of satyāgraha. If it was a matter of obligation between the two, it is satyāgraha which obliged Gandhi rather than the reverse. Satyāgraha would stand or fall by its own merits, only the extent of its application and popularity would depend

upon personalities from time to time. The main question is whether it supplies a really felt human need. If it does; it is bound to live and prosper, Gandhi or no Gandhi. The principle is always *greater than* the person who discovers it or applies it. So too is satyāgraha far greater than all Christs and Gandhis. Satyāgraha is eternal. Gandhi too would be eternal only to the extent that he was able to reflect it and live it in his own life.

Another argument that the sceptics put forward is that it is only the helpless and the weak that would think of satyāgraha and not the strong ones of the earth. They would say that it has no future so far as the strong and the mighty are concerned. Thus they would not accept the statement of Gandhi that satyāgraha is a weapon of the strong. Even so, if according to them it has a great future only with regard to weak peoples, it is not a small thing, because it is often the weak that require a way out. The world is full of the weak. If they were all feeling helpless so long, and if now they feel they can do something to improve their lot and add to their self-respect, it is a great achievement. It is like finding a remedy for the anaemic of the earth! Feeling helpless is itself a mental disease that cripples people. Hope and faith, therefore, are always tonics and if in addition people have a weapon with which to fight and come out of their helplessness, such a weapon is bound to have a great future. Nor can it be said absolutely that the strong and the mighty who have weapons and who can wield weapons would never take to it. If in India satyāgraha had appealed only to 'the weak and the meek Hindu' of the plains, it would have been another matter. But now we have seen that the warlike Sikhs could and did wield satyāgraha, and that too in a masterly way. We have also seen that the sturdy and strong Mussalman Pathan of the mountainous frontier of India fell in love with it, discarded his sword and the spirit of revenge, and took to nonviolence. These two instances show that the statement that it is a weapon of the weak has no basis. My plea is that the adoption of satyāgraha does not and should not merely and always depend upon the strength or weakness of body or mind. One has to weigh its use from the point of view of the ultimate good, of ends and means, of higher culture, of human trends, of practicability, of profit and loss. If one feels, after full consideration, that violence is a better way, then one is free to use it, nay it is one's duty to take to it. But if one feels that nonviolence is a better way, then whether one is weak

path and follow it at all costs.

This is the background and we have now to peep into the future. It is certainly difficult to speak of the future. There is no doubt that the past of satyāgraha is brilliant, its present is interesting and its future promising. But the future will depend upon certain concrete factors, if all goes well.

Unless the world is really war-weary and the people disgusted with the barren results of mutual slaughter, and until they are free from the spell of war-mongers, they are not going to be interested in the doctrine of love and peace. The main attraction in satyāgraha is that it is able to give results, better results than war and at a lesser cost and with a high moral coefficient. But unless there is hunger for peace and peaceful methods this attraction is likely to prove fruitless. No doubt, great thinkers and philosophers and churchmen are hankering after peaceful methods. But theirs is yet a sentimental or reformist endeavour. They are not willing to put themselves against the forces that stand for violence. They are yet trying very feebly to organize themselves against the war-makers in their own countries. But the number of protestants against war is increasing and that is certainly a good sign. It goes without saying that unless such people organize and are willing to go to the extent of taking to direct action, they will not be able to dislodge those who stand for and resort to violence.

Once there is a real demand for peaceful direct action then the spread of the doctrine is easy. It has been sufficiently demonstrated. These demonstrations have been known throughout the world, though better publicity may be necessary. The technique has been sufficiently developed to be understood by intelligent as well as illiterate people. One wishes that Gandhi the originator, the experimenter, the demonstrator, the expert, were still alive to dispel any doubts, correct any mistakes and to guard against misinterpretations. That could not be. But Vinoba is there, and Dr Martin Luther King Jr by his martyrdom has left a blazing trail for the world to see and follow.

Possibly the western countries with their more vigorous and active life may be able to develop this science of satyāgraha much more rapidly than India, the land of its birth. It might be that India by her spiritual traditions and by her age-long culture, was a congenial place to give rise and shape to this great doctrine. But once the method has been evolved, it can be used by all who wish to go along

that path and there is nothing in it that bars others from following it. It is based on human psychology and the human mind is everywhere almost the same.

If one were to look at human evolution and the evolution of human institutions, one sees that man has been averse to violence and is proceeding progressively towards nonviolence. If that trend continues, there is no reason why in the next few decades satyāgraha should not get a more honoured place in the institutions that go to solve human conflicts. Satyāgraha as a way of life has for long had a permanent and prominent place in the lives of men. There is no doubt about it. But what we are mainly concerned with here is satyāgraha as a social weapon, a means for social change. Even if it gains a foothold in western societies as an intra-national weapon for solving social conflicts, it would go a long way towards advancing the cause of nonviolence. Today in Europe only impotent liberalism or helpless violent extremism unable to organize itself is in evidence as a method of combating evil. No violent organization worth the name can be tolerated for long by any constituted government. Thus when all the institutional procedures and constitutional methods have failed, the reformers have no remedy today except fretting and fuming. If the reformers make bold to take to this nonviolent direct action after preparation, they are sure to bring due moral pressure on any group of men,, on any institution, or any government.

It is a good sign that great thinkers like Romain Rolland, Albert Einstein, C.E.M. Joad, Aldous Huxley and Gerald Heard have been thinking along the lines of nonviolent resistance. There are many chapters in Aldous Huxley's book, *Ends and Means*, which are an excellent commentary on the Gandhian method of satyāgraha. It well repays reading at any time. Richard Gregg's *Power of Non-violence* is a regular treatise on satyāgraha, its implications, its technique, and its discipline. Mulford Q. Sibley's *The Quiet Battle* is illustrative of the nonviolent battles waged since the dawn of history. These books show that the western mind is already applying itself to the study of this important subject. But one need not be too optimistic. We must ultimately depend upon the full success of that method in India even after Svarāj, and that alone can ensure the future of satyāgraha as an effective, efficient weapon in the armoury of the ardent reformer, the restless revolutionary, and the fighter for good and great causes.

CHAPTER 16

SATYĀGRAHA AND PACIFISM

Gandhi was loved and admired by pacifists all over the world. In fact, World Pacifists proposed to meet in India in 1949 with a view to obtaining his personal guidance in their work. Unfortunately that could not be; but still their respect for him was so great that they did not change the venue and did meet in India in Sevagram to pay their tribute to him, even after his passing away.

Perhaps the almost universal acceptance of Gandhi was due to the fact that often enough he was all things to all people but always with a sharp difference. He declared himself a sanātani Hindu but said that he was not willing to accept anything that was against reason and morality. He knocked off untouchability as a blot and an inhuman tradition and all but battered the caste system out of shape. He said he was a communist but minus its violence and all that it implied. He loved Christianity and the missionaries and also Islam and all other religions but warned them off their proselytising zeal and activities therefor. In the case of pacifism and pacifists too, he was uncompromisingly against all war but he went far beyond the profession and practice of the anti-war cult, and stood for total nonviolence.

Pacifism is neither new nor of a uniform type. The oldest pacifist could be traced to a Christian convert who refused to be conscripted as a Roman soldier. He said he would not join as that would involve killing men. If this Christian could be looked upon as a typically historical pacifist, we have the latest description of one in the monthly magazine, *Pacifist*, the mouthpiece of the Peace Pledge Union of London: a pacifist is one who pledges himself to renounce war and never sanction any. The implication and implementation of such a pledge opens an unlimited horizon to individual and corporate action of a necessarily nonviolent nature, leading ultimately to the creation of a society in which war is an outmoded institution, and in which mankind learns to live creatively and at peace and in harmony with fellow beings. There are several varieties of pacifists and Gene Sharp distinguishes nine types, from 'non-resistance' to war at one end, to 'nonviolent revolution' against all war and violence at the other. There are utilitarians as well as anarchists,

liberals, Quakers and others among the pacifists. But what is common to all is resistance to all war, propaganda against war and war preparations, non-participation in war and readiness to suffer for their convictions. There are, however, groups among pacifists who, in a defensive war, would serve in non-combatant activities and would not go to the extent of refusing taxes to their government. Today among the pacifists we can also count extremists who actively resist war and war preparations and go to the extent of picketing and offering civil disobedience.

If we try to trace the tradition of pacifism and war resistance, we find that the early Christians followed Christ strictly in his gospel of peace and non-resistance to evil with evil. But after Constantine made Christianity a State religion (in 324 A.D.), he secured the allegiance of all Christians to the State and its actions, be they of peace or of war. It was the heretical sects such as the Albigenses, the Waldenses, the Anabaptists and the Mennonites which kept on the real Christian tradition and swore by the doctrine of 'Love your enemy'. If we bring the story of war resistance and pacifism to modern times, in the western world we find the Quakers, the reconciliation groups, Tolstoy, and the Dukhobars following the principles of pacifism. Love, non-resistance to violence with violence, and suffering for these principles are common to such groups. As long ago as 1838 we have Adim Ballou and William Lloyd Garrison in America preaching against all war and war preparations and trying to convert people to their view by persuasion and education. In 1917, Mennonites actually invited punishment in America for refusal to join war.

While this has been the position as regards those who have been ranging themselves against all violence and war, there have been thinkers and politicians who have said that conflict, war, and destruction of life and property have been a natural and inevitable phenomenon in human affairs. Heraclitus, Polybius, Hsun Tzu, Kautilya, Ibn Khaldun, Machiavelli and Clausewitz have untiringly said that conflict is the law of life. As uncompromisingly have Buddha, Jesus, Ruskin, Emerson, Thoreau, Tolstoy and Prince Kropotkin declared that love and peace are the law for human beings. Gandhi is the latest and the greatest apostle of peace and love. Gandhi has declared that conflict of interest may be there, it is there; but the solution ought to be found by arriving at truth, by thorough inquiry and then by the use of all nonviolent methods against evil and injustice

without illwill towards the persons concerned. Gandhi's armoury would consist of educating the public about the truth, self-purification, mass demonstrations, temporary non-cooperation, picketing, boycott, no-tax, civil disobedience, mass migration, fasting and so on.

Though, as a spiritual anarchist, Gandhi believes that a day would dawn when there need not be any conflict or violence, as a practical man of the world, he agrees that there is conflict. But he believes that man is evolving and that his duty is to see that the forces of love and construction take the place of hatred and destruction.

Therefore, he not only goes far beyond the limited objective of prevention of war and violence and destruction but advocates positive nonviolent resistance to all evil, injustice and exploitation. He relevantly asks the pacifists how they can abolish war so long as the whole of Europe is engaged in raising its standard of life by the exploitation of weaker nations. Gandhi aims not merely at avoidance of war but the removal of the roots and seeds of war which lie in the hearts of men, men who are selfish, greedy and relentless in the exploitation of others. Gandhi's nonviolence or love is a positive, active force to be hurled at all evil and injustice wherever it may be found. Gandhi's unique contribution is in developing nonviolence as an organised force and supplying a strategy and technique against evil and injustice, as powerful as violence but less harmful, more dignified and elevating to both the parties. Gandhi's satyāgraha principles and technique are not only a means of evolution of the inner potentialities of man but they are also means of mass resistance against all unjust authority in a manner and on a scale undreamt of by anyone in history.

Human life, a human being, and human society are an organic whole, an integrated complex growth and an evergrowing and dynamic one. Gandhi goes about searching for the truth of life, the true laws of the evolution of man towards the higher reaches of love, peace and harmony. He discovers that a mere stopping of wars would not be the final remedy but that the removal of the seeds of war, the evil in the hearts of men, would be necessary. Therefore he prescribes by preaching and practice the use of love and nonviolent means to see that the path for the progress of future humanity is cleared once and for all. As different from pacifism, his doctrine of truth through love or nonviolence has an ultimate and an inalienable value in the evolution of mankind. While Gandhi welcomes pacifism to the extent that it is a force against war, he would point out that it is not enough.

In fact it is a strange irony that Pacifists were defending British rule and abusing Gandhi up to 1930 through the columns of their journal, *Friend*. They also found fault with him when he took part in the Zulu War as an ambulance man! Gandhi has given explanations of his conduct regarding the part he played in the three wars. It was at the time of World War II that he declared complete non-cooperation. He has frankly admitted that even at the time of World War I, he had not realised the totally evil nature of the British Government in India. Therefore he felt it his duty to help the British Government in the earlier wars as a loyal citizen and as a non-combatant. Whether one is satisfied or not with Gandhi's explanations, Gandhi had conscientious reasons for acting as he did on those occasions.

By now it is quite clear that pacifism is not by any standard a philosophy or a way of life. Satyāgraha, of which Gandhi is the originator, is a way of life which attaches absolute values to truth as apprehended from time to time and love or nonviolence as the best means of realising the truth of life. The next most important thing about Gandhi's outlook is that purity of means is of paramount importance. Gandhi's nonviolence is a principle to be applied to the whole of life and to all problems. Finally, Gandhi does not consider war as an isolated problem. It is of a piece with the whole problem of life and can and ought to be tackled as such. There Gandhi envisaged a progressive human society for the early realisation of which he perfected the technique of satyāgraha.

CHAPTER 17

ORGANIZATION AND TRAINING

Satyāgraha is a way of life and has a system of philosophy behind it. A satyāgrahī has to follow a strict code of conduct based on self-control and loving service. Truth and love are his guiding principles. Purification of his physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual energies, their conservation by self-control, concentration on all that is truthful and therefore beautiful and the use of his energies through active service for the promotion of peace and happiness to all, constitute, in brief, the sādhanā of a satyāgrahī. A satyāgrahī is always trained and ready for any emergency.

Satyāgraha can be resorted to to remedy any evil. A satyāgrahī should see whether the cause is truthful and the people ready and determined to fight on nonviolent lines. There may be occasions, however, like the attack on the self-respect of a people by the imposition of a punitive tax, when satyāgraha has to be launched at a moment's notice. But normally very careful and adequate organization is necessary before the struggle.

The one great advantage of satyāgraha over violent warfare is that the commander of the nonviolent army need not wait for numbers. Even a single satyāgrahī can begin a fight and continue it if the cause is just. Another advantage is that no material equipment is necessary; the preparation is always mental and moral. The responsibility is all the greater, especially when satyāgraha claims to replace violent means.

Organization is the orderly marshalling of available forces with a view to quickly bringing about a particular result. An exceptional organizer creates new forces as well, or uses available forces to obtain results far beyond their capacity. But every organizer has to be a good judge of his material and should be thrifty and sparing about its use.

While inspiration has its place of honour in human life and affairs, organization is no less necessary for achieving results. Even Gandhi, who depended upon his inner voice for his great decisions, took good care to organize and discipline his life so strictly and carefully that every minute was accounted for and everything was done

with clockwork regularity.

In fact, so far as satyāgraha is concerned, if Gandhi has done anything about it, he organized it on a solid foundation. He made it a fine science with a comparatively perfected technique. He proved by his experiments that satyāgraha was not merely an individual virtue, but that masses could be organized, trained and disciplined to use it as an effective weapon.

Almost the first step in the organization of and preparation for satyāgraha is to create a band of well-trying, pure-hearted workers. They must be men who have an active faith in satyāgraha. Violence has been too much with us all these days. Where we see that we cannot fight violently we usually feel that we are undone and submit to the violence of the other side. Those who feel like this will not serve our purpose. Only those who feel convinced that there is another way of resistance, a better way of fighting, requiring no physical force or material equipment, are fit to be satyāgrahīs. If men who lack that spirit guide a fight, there is every likelihood of their abandoning the fight and collapsing or trying to use violence. Only those who believe in truth and nonviolence as a creed must take the initiative.

Aldous Huxley in his *Ends and Means* has something instructive to say about the training of nonviolent resisters and their function in society. He says that associations of devoted individuals will have to cultivate systematically nonviolent behaviour in all the common relationships of life, personal, economic, group with group and group with government. The social structure of the community can be arranged, in such a way that individuals are not tempted to seek power, to bully, to become repacious. Further training will be needed in the conquest not only of fear but also of anger and hatred. The members must be able to meet violence without counter-violence and without fear or complaint. Huxley says: 'Nonviolent resistance to violent oppression is relatively easy in times of great emotional excitement; but it is very difficult at other times. It is so difficult as to be practically impossible except for those who have undergone systematic training for that very purpose. It takes three to four years to make a good soldier. It probably takes at least as long to make a good nonviolent resister, capable of putting his principle into practice in any circumstances, however horrible.'

Describing the nonviolent soldier's functions, he says that such men should keep the life of the association at a higher level as a

working model of a superior type. And 'they should "go out into the world", where their capacities would be useful in allaying violence once it has broken out and in organizing nonviolent resistance to domestic oppression and in preventing international war'.

Referring to the necessity of organizing masses on nonviolent lines, Huxley says:

All over the world the police are able to act with a rapidity, a precision and a foresight never matched in the past. Moreover, they are equipped with such scientific weapons which ordinary persons cannot procure. Against forces thus armed and organized, violence and cunning are unavailing. The only methods by which a people can protect itself against the tyranny of rulers possessing a modern police force are the nonviolent methods of massive non-cooperation and civil disobedience. Such methods are the only ones which give the people a chance of taking advantage of its superiority in numbers over the ruling class and of discounting its manifest inferiority in armaments. For this reason it is enormously important that the principles of nonviolence should be propagated rapidly and over the widest possible area. For it is only by means of well and widely organized movements of nonviolence that the population of the world can hope to avoid that enslavement to the state which in so many countries is already an accomplished fact and which the threat of war and the advance of technology are in process of accomplishing elsewhere. In the circumstances of our age, most movements of revolutionary violence are likely to be suppressed instantaneously; in cases where the revolutionaries are well-equipped with modern arms the movement will probably turn into a long and stubbornly disputed civil war, as was the case in Spain. The chances that any change for the better will result from such a civil war are exceedingly small. Violence will merely produce the ordinary results of violence and the last state of the country will be worse than the first. This being so, nonviolence presents the only hope of salvation. But in order to resist the assaults of a numerous and efficient police, or, in the case of foreign invasion, of soldiers, nonviolent movements will have to be well-organized and widely spread. The regression from humanitarianism, characteristic of our age, will probably result in manifestations of nonviolent resistance being treated with a severity more ruthless than that displayed by most governments in recent times. Such severities can

only be answered by great numbers and great devotion. Confronted by huge masses determined not to cooperate and equally determined not to use violence, even the most ruthless dictatorship is non-plussed. Moreover, even the most ruthless dictatorship needs the support of public opinion, and no government which massacres or imprisons large numbers of systematically nonviolent individuals can hope to retain such support. Once dictatorial rule has been established, the task of organizing non-violent resistance to tyranny or war becomes exceedingly difficult. The hope of the world lies in those countries where it is still possible for individuals to associate freely, express their opinions without constraint, and in general have their being at least in partial independence of the state.

These long excerpts point out both the importance and the difficulty of training bands of competent workers who would take the message of nonviolence to the masses.

Constructive work among the masses is the best preparation for satyāgraha. Men having faith in truth and nonviolence, men of character, if they live among the masses and serve them selflessly, are sure to infect them with their faith and inspire fearlessness. Gandhi said in 1930 (*Young India*, 9 January): 'Trust begotten in the pursuit of continuous constructive work becomes a tremendous asset at the critical moment. Constructive work is for a nonviolent army what drilling etc. is for an army designed for bloody warfare. . . . The more therefore the progress of the constructive programme the greater is the chance for civil disobedience.' While comparing a soldier with a constructive worker Gandhi says (*Harijan*, 29-10-1933): 'A soldier is trained to kill. He has reduced killing to an art. A satyāgrahī would always long for an opportunity to serve silently. All his time would be given to labours of love. He would not dream of killing but of dying for others. Those who wish to live in terms of truth and nonviolence and yet dislike constructive work are like those who like the battle-field but hate to handle the rifle. If they think that constructive work is insipid and full of drudgery, they are not yet fit for satyāgraha, nor do they understand the beauty of the silent strength that accumulates as a result of selfless service and sacrifice.'

Constructive work aims at the multi-sided regeneration of a whole nation. Any army of social workers with faith in truth and non-violence, engaged in constructive work in any area, would transform

self-confident people. The items of work that they choose should cater to the real human needs of the community. Such workers would open a new vista of life for the people there. They would serve them constantly and selflessly but in a manner which would make them self-helping and independent. Their relation with the people would be neither mechanical nor mercenary. It would be a contact which would inspire confidence in themselves and develop faith in the satyāgrahī worker. The community will always have before them examples of fearless men of character devoted to the service of humanity. This kind of work done in an organized manner would stand in good stead when the necessity for organizing a community for satyāgraha arises. While the work itself raises the standard and status of the people, the way and the manner of doing it and the pure motives behind it sow the seeds of cooperation, unity, mutual aid, love of truth and disdain for untruth and injustice.

Viewed in this context, Gandhi's insistence on the fulfilment of the constructive programme in those areas where intensive satyāgraha, such as a no-tax campaign or mass civil disobedience, is to be launched is understandable.

Let us take the case of Bardoli on the eve of the no-tax campaign in 1922. The All India Congress Committee (A.I.C.C.) postulated certain conditions for starting either individual or mass civil disobedience in the provinces. It insisted that an individual offering civil disobedience must know hand-spinning, must have fulfilled the part of the constructive programme applicable to him, must be a believer in the unity of all communities and in nonviolence as absolutely essential, and if a Hindu, must show by personal conduct that he regards untouchability as a blot upon Hinduism. In the case of mass civil disobedience, the vast majority of the population had to believe in full swadeshi before a movement could be launched. The A.I.C.C. further laid down that civil resisters and their families should not expect to be supported out of Congress funds. Let us see how far Bardoli was prepared, according to these conditions. Fifty-one out of sixty-five schools had been nationalized. There was perfect Hindu-Muslim unity. Untouchability was fast disappearing as a custom. Khaddar was spreading apace. Gandhi writing in *Young India* on 2 January 1922 says: 'Bardoli has come to a momentous decision. It has made its final and irrevocable choice. . . . I took the sense of the meeting (4,000 khaddar-clad audience with 500 women among

the implications of Hindu-Muslim-Parsi-Christian unity. They realised the significance and the truth of nonviolence. They saw what the removal of untouchability meant. . . . They knew that they could not exercise the privilege of non-payment of revenue and other forms of civil disobedience until they had purified themselves in the manner described by me. They knew that they had to become industrious and spin their own yarn and weave their own khaddar. And lastly, they were ready to face imprisonment and death if necessary, and they would do all this without resentment.'

Gandhi would not allow Bardoli to refuse to pay taxes before it had advanced far enough in constructive activities. It was another matter that satyāgraha was not launched there at that time, which was on account of the violent outbreaks at Chauri Chaura.

While we are yet on the subject of Bardoli, let us see how it was organized for satyāgraha in the form of the no-tax campaign of 1928. It was one of the most successful and typical satyāgraha campaigns conducted under the inspiration and guidance of Gandhi. Though the no-tax campaign was not started in 1922, constructive activities once begun had continued. Four āśrams or centres of constructive activity on the lines chalked out by Gandhi were continuously working since 1921 in that tāluk. There were a number of selfless workers as well. As soon as it was decided to take up the no-tax campaign the main command was given to Sardar Patel. He was an organizing genius. He immediately started some more suitable centres and trained a band of village volunteers under intelligent captains. This network of centres and volunteers served as a nervous system for the tāluk. This enabled the Sardar to get a correct and quick report of everything that was happening at any time in any village. Then there was the daily bulletin to give instructions and information to every village. At one time about 10,000 copies of this bulletin were distributed in the tāluk and 4,000 outside. The Sardar himself would flit from village to village and camp to camp, inspiring, guiding and encouraging the people to keep their pledge of withholding the increase in the land tax. The Sardar also addressed numerous meetings of villagers. He was the only spokesman for the tāluk, and as a matter of discipline, no one else was allowed to talk. In fact, Gandhi himself observed this rule when he later visited the tāluk. When the Government started its engine of repression and workers were arrested, they were replaced immediately by others and the organization was kept intact to the end. Volunteers from the tāluk

came forward cheerfully to carry on the work. Folksongs and stories of heroism and sacrifice kept up the morale of the people as much as their faith in ultimate victory. The main work of the organization was keeping up communications, carrying on propaganda throughout the tāluk and outside, giving suitable instructions from time to time to meet Government measures, keeping up the morale of the peasants, securing resignations of village officers, picketing of Government auctions, maintaining non-cooperation with Government servants, and so on. It may be noted that this work has many similarities with a military campaign. Thus it requires all the skill and resourcefulness of a military commander to conduct a satyāgraha campaign successfully without making mistakes in strategy and tactics.

This brief description of the organization, its scope and function in Bardoli gives a rough idea of the methods of organizing and preparing a people for a satyāgraha campaign and keeping alive their interest in the struggle. For greater details one should read *The Story of Bardoli* by Mahadev Desai.

To return to preparation. The basic preparation in satyāgraha is the inculcation of faith in truth and its ultimate triumph. In fact, what exists and acts and succeeds is truth. Whenever the question of offering satyāgraha arises, the people concerned must be sure that truth, as they see it, is on their side. Then only can they have sufficient determination and moral strength to stake for it everything they possess. Next comes the question of the pursuit of truth through love and nonviolence. It is evil and untruth that we want to fight and not the evil-doers who are, after all, ourselves in other garbs. That is why a satyāgrahī does not intend any harm to others.

While constructive work goes on and when the fundamentals of satyāgraha have been taught to the people, the next step in preparation is purification. Like constructive work, this too is a continuous process. People should purge themselves of all evil, of all bad habits, of addiction to drink and drugs. They should cease to help any evil or injustice that might be around them. They may undertake fasts for the purpose. They may pray as well and take up penance. All these would strengthen the would-be satyāgrahīs as nothing else can. Then should come their resolve to resist the wrong with all their strength.

The pledge that one should take every day may run as follows:

I shall not fear anyone on earth. I shall fear truth or God alone. I shall bear ill-will towards none. I shall submit to no

injustice wherever and from whomsoever it might be. I shall conquer untruth with truth. While conquering untruth with truth, hate with love, injustice with justice, I shall put up with all suffering cheerfully and with goodwill towards all.

Armed with this resolve, satyāgrahīs may take up the fight, making themselves doubly sure that their cause is truthful. They may then follow the technique which is given in detail elsewhere.

Military training induces almost a mechanical habit of obedience. Human beings become automatons. 'Theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do and die.' Thus millions are trained to shoot to order, kill to order, and die to order, if need be. In an army, discipline is the greatest virtue and indiscipline the greatest crime, punishable even with instant death on occasions.

The discipline necessary for a nonviolent soldier is necessarily different from that required by a violent soldier. The one is to kill, the other to die; the one to hate, the other to love; the one to get angry, the other to be patient; the one to inspire fear, the other to face even death fearlessly; the one to inflict pain, the other to suffer pain without complaint. Thus, since the purpose of training a violent soldier is quite different from that of training a nonviolent one, it follows that the training has to be different. But the methods of training would, in both cases, be based upon the study of human psychology and its laws.

One of the strongest objections raised by even sympathetic men like the Irish poet George Russell and the great military writer Liddell Hart is that nonviolent resistance makes too great a demand on human nature. The same must have been said of individual non-violent resistance before the early Christian martyrs gave manifest evidence of what men can do and suffer in the cause of truth. In all ages men have revealed unsuspected reserves of strength. Moreover, habit and training have the capacity to bring out the hidden powers of the human being, of which we have normally no conception. Therefore, it is too early to say at any time, 'This cannot be done'. Who could dream of the endurance of the Dharasana heroes before one saw it? Who could predict the cool courage of the Guruka Bagh martyrs?

I do not propose to go into details here as this subject has been treated scientifically by Richard Gregg both in his *The Power of Non-violence* and *A Discipline for Nonviolence*. I would only remark that the satyāgrahī requires more of self-discipline than the mechanical discipline of the soldier, though he cannot do without a good deal of that too. It is not really easy to get into the habit of loving all, refusing to be angry, and suffering without ill-will. A severe course of meditation and prayer and a recasting of the values of life alone can give a man a grounding in such a new outlook on life. But there is no doubt that it is worth doing and thus help a new nonviolent civilization to come into existence.

Richard Gregg rightly contends that habits of obedience, self-respect and self-reliance, self-control and self-sacrifice, tenacity of will, sense of unity with others (including the opponent), endurance of common hardships, sense of order and cooperation, energy, courage, equanimity and poise, practice in handling moral equivalents of weapons are developed as much by widespread, habitual, and intelligent hardwork done in common as by military training. The main difference, however, is that, in the case of military training the soldier is habituated to obey an external authority, while in the case of this training, the primary obedience is to one's conscience and one's ideals.

While summing up his suggestions in the chapter of self-discipline in *The Power of Nonviolence*, Gregg says:

The principles underlying all the foregoing suggestions are truth, love, spiritual unity, equality, gentleness, simplicity, self-purification and self-suffering as a means of persuasion. Search for these principles everywhere on every occasion. Immerse yourself in these concepts. Let your imagination dwell upon them. Meditate upon them regularly and often. Seek persons, books and environments which tend to strengthen them and illuminate their implications, applications and results. Try constantly to practise them so as to understand them better. Bear always in mind the effect of frequent repetition of gentle stimuli, and the necessity for persistence and patience. . . . Perhaps the best descriptions of the discipline are the lives of great teachers of this idea, Buddha, Christ, St Francis of Assisi, George Fox, John Woolman, Gandhi and others.

Let me close this chapter by giving a brief description of a typical soldier of satyāgraha. It would give us a good idea of the preparation and discipline necessary for a satyāgrahī. We expect in a satyāgrahī certain physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual qualifications and standards in order that he may be able to prepare the people along those lines.

Spiritually he must believe in truth, in a higher power; that he is himself something more than mere body; that he is beyond the physical grasp of the tyrant or the evil-doer. He must look upon all mankind and all life as one. He must love all, have goodwill for the opponent. He must hold himself to be merely an instrument in the hands of Truth or God that guides all, and be ready to sacrifice his all. He must cultivate purity and purge himself of all unclean thoughts. He should have a clear vision of the truth he is following.

Morally he must be fearless, bold, courageous, civil, humble, truthful, open and ever alert in assessing good and evil, vice and virtue. He must eschew violence in any shape or form. He must ever be optimistic and cheerful. He must know the implications of his steps, he must be able to explain to others his own actions and convictions.

Physically he should be healthy, hardy, inured to manual labour, able to stand pain and suffering. He should be satisfied with simple food, coarse clothing and a hard bed. He should not get nervous if he becomes ill. He must be active and agile. He must be able to move about on foot among villagers.

Unless a satyāgrahī has these qualifications, which are the minimum, it would be difficult for him to prepare the people for satyāgraha.

SATYĀGRAHA — ITS TECHNIQUE

Technique means the recognised and scientific method of doing a thing. Satyāgraha as a social weapon, used and wielded by masses does not claim to be a very old one. But still Gandhi, who is mainly responsible for its recent development, has evolved by instinct and through experience a certain method and this method may be called its technique.

A satyāgrahī's primary concern is to uphold truth and fight for it through love or nonviolence, by self-suffering. No field of activities, social, economic, political, national, or international is excluded from his sphere of activities. Only he begins by serving those that are nearest and takes up the causes of people among whom he lives and the problems that await an immediate solution.

Whenever there is a conflict or grievance or a wrong which can be redressed by the application of mass or group satyāgraha, a satyāgrahī must first convince himself of the truthfulness of the cause. If after a full, careful and disinterested investigation he finds that the grievance is real, the next thing he has to see is whether those who are suffering from it are keenly feeling the necessity to get rid of it. As soon as a satyāgrahī realizes the enormity of the grievance, he should bring it to the notice of the perpetrators of the wrong in the gentlest language possible and try to convince them of their responsibility for it. Then he should give due and truthful publicity to the facts of the situation without any exaggeration. An agitation based on an appeal to reason should be carried on through the usual means of the press and the platform, taking care to be always truthful, restrained and civil in thought, word and deed. In the meanwhile, and consciousness of those who are suffering must be roused and the satyāgrahī must make himself sure whether they are ready to suffer and follow the path of satyāgraha. If a substantial majority of the people agrees to offer satyāgraha they should be strengthened in their resolve. If a majority is not willing, it is no bar to launch individual satyāgraha to rouse the consciousness of the sufferers and set an example. In the meanwhile, those who are responsible for the wrong should be apprised of the situation and requested to redress the wrong. If

nothing comes out of it, and when a serious struggle becomes inevitable, a suitable form of satyāgraha is decided upon. The form ought to meet the requirements of the situation and should be one which has a universal appeal and in which the largest number can take part. All other means should be tried before sātīyāgraha is finally launched. It is as serious and irrevocable as war, only it is nonviolent. After due notice to the wrong-doers alone should satyāgraha be launched; of course, adequate organization and preparation must precede the step.

The people concerned must, first of all, take a pledge and begin with a programme of self-purification. The solemnity of the pledge and the arduous task ahead need not in any way frighten the people. They should rather stiffen them in their resolve. It should be emphasized that the weapon they are using is morally superior to that of their opponents and that success is certain if they carry on the struggle unflinchingly. As the fight gathers momentum there may at times be interludes of depression and gloom. These feelings must be combated by making the people realize the higher values of life. There should be no slackening at any time in the drive to organize the people, and the organizers must at no time give up their optimism. The struggle is sure to end in victory, if there is sufficient faith in the higher powers, in the truthfulness of their cause, and readiness to suffer to the end without ill-will. Never bend, never lower the flag. But ever be ready to concede in non-essentials when the opponent is sufficiently moved or compelled.

When the war of nerves goes on, when the opponent sees that you would rather break than bend and that he is morally wrong, he is likely to come down and, after a time, he is sure to come to terms. It may be by conversion, which, of course, is a consummation devoutly to be wished in a satyāgraha campaign; or it may be that the opponent sees his folly and yields; or it may be by moral compulsion; or again, he may want to compromise when he sees that he would lose all if he persisted in his wrongful actions. Whatever happens, the satyāgrahī is bound to succeed in the end.

It is necessary that satyāgraha campaigns should not be dependent for finance upon outsiders as far as possible. Whatever finance is required should be locally raised and very economically spent. Correct accounts must be kept of every pie collected and spent. The main strength of the struggle lies in the moral fibre of the people and not in any external stimulus or financial help. Faith in truth, God, and

faith in themselves ought alone to lead them in their chosen path.

If there are arrests, the people should willingly submit and while in prison obey the jail rules not repugnant to their religion or self-respect. One should conform to the jail regulations unless one launches a campaign for prison reform. There should be no heart-burning over the arrest of people. It should be an occasion for congratulation. No indiscipline should be tolerated in the ranks, and since satyāgraha does not believe in corporal punishment, it would be fasting or some other form of self-suffering that the organizers would have to resort to, to remedy any evil or weakening among the followers.

If property is attached and taken away and similar other hardships are imposed, they should be borne with equanimity and one should cultivate the habit of smiling in the face of death itself. It is only after undergoing all this ordeal that a satyāgrahī would see the light and the dawn of a better day.

Let me first consider the technique in the case of individual satyāgraha. It must be remembered that here I am speaking of satyāgraha as a weapon for fighting injustice. The occasion for it may arise either when one is not allowed to carry on one's legitimate activities; or when it is decided—as it was in 1919, 1933 and 1940—to offer disobedience individually and not in groups or in the mass, for a political objective; or when one feels called upon to do so on account of any particular grievance or situation.

In disobeying any order or law that prohibits a certain person from carrying on his legitimate duty, one need not have knowledge of the finer points of satyāgraha technique. He is to declare his intention to disobey the order, and invite the penalty cheerfully. But it is absolutely essential that he should be civil throughout. The word 'civil' does not signify being merely 'courteous in words' but it implies everything that nonviolence implies. Gandhi says, (*Young India*, 24-3-1920): 'Disobedience to be civil must be sincere, respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based on some well-understood principle, must not be capricious and above all must have no ill-will or hatred behind it.' The same technique is to be followed when one feels that individual civil disobedience is absolutely necessary to redress a particular grievance.

In 1919 at the time of the Rowlatt Act Satyāgraha, a Satyāgraha Committee was formed. A pledge was prepared. It was signed by those individuals who wanted to offer satyāgraha. Then the Satyā-

graha Committee advised civil disobedience of laws regarding prohibited literature and registration of newspapers. Pledged satyāgrahīs alone were to offer civil disobedience from a specified date. The programme of hartāl, fast, prayers and meetings was meant for the general public who were not supposed to resort to civil disobedience.

One can have a fair idea of the technique to be followed from the 'notice to organize, regulate and control' the sale of prohibited publications, which was issued by the Satyāgraha Committee. It reads as follows:

Satyāgrahīs should, as far as possible, write their names and addresses as sellers so that they may be traced easily when wanted by the Government for prosecution. Naturally there can be no question of secret sale of this literature. At the same time, there should be no forwardness either, in distributing it. It is open to satyāgrahīs to form small groups of men and women to whom they may read this class of literature. The object in selecting prohibited literature is not merely to commit a civil breach of the law regarding it, but it is also to supply people with clean literature of high moral value. It is to be expected that the Government will confiscate such literature. Satyāgrahīs have to be as independent of finance as possible. When therefore copies are confiscated, satyāgrahīs are requested to make copies of prohibited literature themselves or by securing the assistance of willing friends, and to make use of it until it is confiscated by giving readings to the people from it. It is stated that such readings would amount to dissemination of prohibited literature. When all copies are exhausted by dissemination or confiscation, satyāgrahīs may continue civil disobedience by writing out and distributing extracts from accessible books.

Regarding the civil breach of the law governing the publication of newspapers, the idea is to publish in every Satyāgraha Centre a written newspaper without registering it. It need not occupy more than one side of a foolscap sheet. A satyāgrahi for whom punishments provided by law have lost all terror can give only in an unregistered newspaper his thoughts and opinions, unhampered by any consideration other than that of his own conscience. His newspaper, therefore, if otherwise well edited, can become a most powerful vehicle for transmitting pure ideas in a concise manner, and there need be no fear of inability to circulate a handwritten newspaper, for it will be the duty of those who may receive the

first copies to recopy till at last the process of multiplication is made to cover, if necessary, the whole of the masses of India; and it must not be forgotten that we have in India the tradition of imparting instructions by oral teaching.

The following are the instructions regarding arrest, defence, etc.: We are now in a position to expect to be arrested at any moment. It is, therefore, necessary to bear in mind that if anyone is arrested, he should, without causing any difficulty, allow himself to be arrested, and if summoned to appear before a Court, he should do so. No defence should be offered and no pleaders engaged in the matter. If a fine is imposed with the alternative of imprisonment, the imprisonment should be accepted. If only a fine is imposed, it ought not to be paid; but his property, if he has any, should be allowed to be sold. There should be no demonstration of grief or otherwise, made by the remaining satyāgrahīs, by reason of the arrest and imprisonment of their comrade. It cannot be too often repeated that we court imprisonment, and we may not complain of it when we actually receive it. When once imprisoned, it is our duty to conform to all prison regulations, as prison reform is no part of our campaign at the present moment. A satyāgrahī may not resort to surreptitious practices. All that the satyāgrahīs do can only and must be done openly.

Then let us consider also the individual satyāgraha campaign of 1940-1941. It was decided to offer civil disobedience on the issue of freedom of opinion and speech with regard to war. Gandhi asked for lists of pledged satyāgrahīs from all provinces. He scrutinized them before allowing any to offer civil disobedience. The pledge was very strict and required that the civil resister concerned should be a regular spinner and adhere strictly to nonviolence. Each pledged satyāgrahī was to send a written notice to the District Magistrate, intimating to him the time and place where he would exercise his right of free speech.

Now let me describe in brief the technique adopted by Gandhi while launching one of the greatest movements, that of 1930. That may serve as an illustration.

Six main points may be considered essential in the technique of a satyāgrahī: the grievance must be genuine, the opponent must have been given the fullest chance to correct himself, all other remedies must have been exhausted, the resistance must be nonviolent in the shape of inviting self-suffering with full faith in Truth or God, the

suffering must be ungrudging, cheerful and with goodwill even towards him who inflicts it, and there should be humility all through and a readiness to compromise without giving up principles.

If we look at the civil disobedience movement of 1930, we can easily see that Gandhi followed this well-known technique to the minutest detail. He made himself sure that truth was on his side. The ultimate objective was India's independence and he was preparing the ground for a long time. Even in 1924, he had written: 'I live for India's freedom and would die for it, because it is a part of Truth. Only a free India can worship the true God.'

But the Viceroy said that he could not promise that even Dominion Status would be the basis of the proposed Round Table Conference. The Congress then changed its creed to Complete Independence and Gandhi girded up his loins for the fight. He made preparations for Civil Disobedience but at the same time, he again made another offer through his famous eleven points. There was no response from the Government. Every one of the steps he took put the opponent morally in the wrong and every fresh offer from Gandhi and its rejection by the Viceroy created the necessary atmosphere for the struggle. Then he chose the Salt Law for breaking. It was a stroke of genius, for the tax was one of the most unjust levies. The levy was many times the cost of the salt! It touched the poorest as well as the rich and thus the appeal based on that tax was universal. Then before actually breaking the law, he again wrote a letter to the Viceroy. When a disappointing reply came and 'a stone was offered for bread' he started on the Dandi March. The march gripped the imagination of the people and as he advanced towards Dandi, the tempo in the country rose and the climax was reached when he broke the Salt Act on the 6th of April. The choice of the 6th of April, the first day of the National Week since 1919, was not accidental or fortuitous.

Then, from the 6th of April onwards there was a sudden outburst of Civil Disobedience throughout the country and thousands were arrested and thrown into prison. The Government did not arrest him and tried to ignore him. But he was not to be outmanoeuvred. He gave notice that he would raid the Dharasana Salt Depot and try to bring salt, paying its price but not the Government duty. It was an assertion of the moral right of a citizen who believed that the Salt Tax was iniquitous. Then he was arrested and taken to Yeravda.

He lived like a typical prisoner. He never tried to communicate with the outside world nor did he try to direct the movement from inside. He was ever ready to negotiate without sacrificing the fundamentals.

The great movement of 1930 ended in a compromise or rather a truce called the Gandhi-Irwin pact. The preparation for the struggle, the struggle itself, and the compromise with which it ended give an excellent idea as to how a satyāgraha campaign has to be conducted.

Since fasts are a part of the satyāgraha technique, I might well close the chapter by a few words about their place and when and how they can be undertaken.

A fast is in essence purificatory even when it is unto death. But I am not speaking of purificatory fast undertaken to attain self-control or as penance for one's sins. They are absolutely personal. Here I am concerned with fasts which operate as sanctions on others or opponents. What is the technique of such fasts?

They may be either limited or unto death. Even when they are limited and are against the lapses of friends, wards, relatives, or colleagues they have to follow a certain method. No such fast should be undertaken unless the relation between persons concerned have been intimate and the lapse gross enough. It should always be proportionate to the lapse. It should not be undertaken in a huff or in anger. The motive must not be either punishment or publicity. Nor should the fast be unsystematic. The body should not be roughly handled during the fast. There should be no violence against it. It should be treated gently and with a view to cleanse it. The purpose of the fast should be made known to the person concerned. But even here a fast should be the last remedy. During the fast, most of the time should be devoted to prayer, introspection, meditation and things that ennoble the mind. Since fasting is a fiery weapon and a great ordeal, one must sift one's motives very carefully before one undertakes it. There should not be even a trace of impurity. One who has not followed the path of ahimsā and studied how to fast should not rush into it. One must earn the right to fast.

A fast unto death is the last step a satyāgrahī can take. The acme of self-suffering which in satyāgraha is the weapon for winning over the opponent, is death by fasting. When every other form of satyāgraha has failed and there is utter darkness and despair all round, the satyāgrahī may resort to fasting, believing that this final sacrifice of his in the cause of truth would vindicate it. But for that very reason, it is not to be talked of lightly and used without absolute necessity.

Gandhi while speaking about his public fasts in general and especially about fasts unto death says that they all came to him as gifts of God, as inner calls. With all his sādhanā he found that in his Rajkot fast a flaw crept in. Though it was pure in the beginning the impurity and selfishness crept in when he agreed to the intervention of the Viceroy. This shows that it is very difficult to wield the weapon and one has to study it very deeply before contemplating to use it.

Gandhi did not allow an easy use of this weapon. It has yet potentialities which have not been tested. Who knows what would be the effect, for instance, of mass fasts? One has to be content with saying that it is all in the womb of the future.

CHAPTER 20

SOME QUESTIONS

Democracy And Satyāgraha—Are They Contradictory?

Irrespective of the form of government, satyāgraha has a place in human society since it is essentially a way of life and a nonviolent technique of asserting and establishing truth, and of fighting all evil and injustice.

No democracy can claim to be perfect and assert that its rule is totally good or that there is no untruth or injustice anywhere under it. But at the same time every evil and injustice need not necessarily evoke satyāgraha for its eradication. It must be remembered that satyāgraha is always the last weapon and remedy. It is a substitute for a revolution or armed rebellion. It can be justified only when all other means of fighting and removing evil have been exhausted.

It must be conceded that in a democracy there are far more ways of removing evil and injustice than under other forms of government. Provided that there is full freedom of opinion and association and opportunities to educate the public and the government of the day, few occasions may arise when satyāgraha would be necessary. But it can never be said that any government is satyāgraha-proof!

Let us take an instance of a liquor shop which is opened in the midst of a locality that does not want it. Law allows such a shop to be opened. There are the persons who have opened such a shop under a licence. Then the people of the locality have every right to offer satyāgraha but only after exhausting every other means, such as organising public opinion, full publicity, approach to the proper authority, attempts at persuasion to shut the shop and so on. What form satyāgraha should take under certain circumstances would always depend on the way it can be made effective. In the case mentioned above, it may take the form of peaceful picketing of the shop till such a shop disappears from the place.

Can There Be A Satyāgrahī State?

A satyāgrahī State means a State whose final sanction is satyāgraha and not physical force. Today every State, small or big, democratic

or autocratic, has physical force as its final sanction both regarding internal and external affairs and conflicts. Viewing the situation as it is today, it is difficult to imagine that a satyāgrahī State will emerge in the near future.

In a sense a fully democratic State can be said to be using non-violent sanctions for the purposes of legislation as it arrives at decisions by a full debate and exhaustive discussions. But for enforcement of law among its own citizens even a democratic State relies on the police and other instruments of physical force. No attempt has been made so far nor even a single step taken in the direction of satyāgrahic sanctions, say, to organise a nonviolent peace-squad to quell riots or to prevent them. Nor is any educational system being evolved in any country deliberately to train its citizens in the non-violent way of living. Peace education is at a discount and perhaps nobody or no State is thinking of it at that level and on that scale. Nor is there any State in existence today which is encouraging consciously and deliberately any non-official efforts at the organisation of peace-squads or peace councils which would always be alert and act as forces that would prevent violence or lessen its evils when it breaks out. Law and order are being maintained through fear of the violent sanctions which the state may legally apply. Humanity during its transition from the stage of the beast to that of sapient human beings still awaits a whole philosophy of peaceful living and the technique of truthful and nonviolent governance.

This is so far as the internal administration and maintenance of law and order are concerned. International relationships can improve and advance towards peaceful living only if Panchasheela is adopted by all nations as a creed for international living. As regards a State defending itself against aggression on the principles of satyāgraha, Gāndhi has said enough about it, and also indicated as to what shape such a nonviolent defence could take. No one else can or need add anything to it at the present juncture.

Q. 1. Granted that satyāgraha is capable of winning India's independence, what are the chances of its being accepted as a principle of State policy in a free India? In other words, would a strong and independent India rely on satyāgraha as a method of self-preservation, or would it lapse back to seeking refuge in the age-old institution of war, however defensive its character? To restate the question on the basis of a purely theoretical problem: Is satyāgraha likely to be accepted only in an uphill battle, when

the phenomenon of martyrdom is fully effective, or is it also to be the instrument of a sovereign authority which has neither the need nor the scope for behaving on the principle of martyrdom?

Q. 2. Suppose a free India adopts satyāgraha as an instrument of State policy, how would she defend herself against probably aggression by another sovereign State? To restate the question on the basis of a purely theoretical problem: what would be the satyāgrahic action patterns to meet the invading army at the frontier? What kind of resistance can be offered to the opponent before a common area of action, such as the one now existing in India between the Indian nationalists and the British Government, is established? Or should the satyāgrahis withhold their action until after the opponent has taken over the country?

A. The questions are admittedly theoretical. They are also premature for the reason that I have not mastered the whole technique of nonviolence. The experiment is still in the making. It is not even in its advanced stage. The nature of the experiment requires one to be satisfied with one step at a time. The distant scene is not for him to see. Therefore my answers can only be speculative.

In truth, as I have said before, now we are not having unadulterated nonviolence even in our struggle to win independence.

As to the first question, I fear that the chances of nonviolence being accepted as a principle of State policy are very slight, so far as I can see at present. If India does not accept nonviolence as her policy after winning independence, the second question becomes superfluous.

But I may state my own individual view of the potency of nonviolence. I believe that a State can be administered on a non-violent basis if the vast majority of the people are nonviolent. So far as I know, India is the only country which has a possibility of being such a State. I am conducting my experiment in that faith. Supposing, therefore, that India attained independence through pure nonviolence, India could retain it too by the same means. A nonviolent man or society does not anticipate or provide for attacks from without. On the contrary, such a person or society firmly believes that nobody is going to disturb them. If the worst happens, there are two ways open to nonviolence. To yield possession but non-cooperate with the aggressor. Thus, supposing a modern edition of Nero descended upon India the

representatives of the State will let him in but tell him that he will get no assistance from the people. They will prefer death to submission. The second way would be nonviolent resistance by the people who have been trained in the nonviolent way. They would offer themselves unarmed as fodder for the aggressor's cannons. The underlying belief in either case is that even a Nero is not devoid of a heart. The unexpected spectacle of endless rows upon rows of men and women simply dying rather than surrender to the will of an aggressor must ultimately melt him and his soldiery. Practically speaking, there will be probably no greater loss in men than if forcible resistance was offered; there will be no expenditure in armaments and fortifications. The nonviolent training received by the people will add inconceivably to their moral height. Such men and women will have shown personal bravery of a type far superior to that shown in armed warfare. In each case the bravery consists in dying, not in killing. Lastly, there is no such thing as defeat in nonviolent resistance. That such a thing has not happened before is no answer to my speculation. I have drawn no impossible picture. History is replete with instances of individual nonviolence of the type I have mentioned. There is no warrant for saying or thinking that a group of men and women cannot, by sufficient training, act nonviolently as a group or nation. Indeed the sum total of the experience of mankind is that men somehow or other live on. From which fact I infer that it is the law of love that rules mankind. Had violence, i.e. hate ruled us, we should have become extinct long ago. And yet the tragedy of it is that the so-called civilized men and nations conduct themselves as if the basis of society was violence. It gives me ineffable joy to make experiments proving that love is the supreme and only law of life. Much evidence to the contrary cannot shake my faith. Even the mixed nonviolence of India has supported it. But if it is not enough to convince an unbeliever, it is enough to incline a friendly critic to view it with favour.

Is Satyāgraha Consistent With Social Evolution?

Satyāgraha is a way of life based on the search and establishment of truth, i.e. the law of being through nonviolent means alone; it is also a peaceful means of social and economic change which would make way for a society based on truth, freedom, equality and justice.

The question is whether satyāgraha is consistent with and in tune

with the evolution of human beings and human society.

Apart from general biological evolution, which is absolutely beyond our ken and control, we can say that the evolution of the human community is to a certain extent at least influenced by some kind of man's voluntary effort. Two faculties in man operate in this field. One is the imagination of man which holds before him the picture of the future of mankind and urges him to work on towards achieving that future. The second is his self-consciousness which makes him think of himself, his experiences and his actions as an object and influences him to do the needful for bettering his conditions in all directions. His inner hunger is for truth, for peace, for harmony, for friendliness and utter happiness.

The history of the evolution of human society so far is writ large in the process which took man from the tribal stage to the present stage when he has begun to think in terms of one humanity with all its variety, living in peace and happiness. There have been wars and very bloody ones at that, they are still going on and there will be many more. But they are more like diseases in the course of normal healthy living. They are like unwanted disturbances. It was this fact which made Gandhi declare that love is the law of the human species as physical force is the law of the jungle.

One would argue that war and violence, though instrument of destruction, tend towards future construction. But experience has shown that wars do not solve any problems. When they impose a solution, that solution, being one imposed by force and not by voluntary acceptance, sows the seeds of violent reaction and revolt. Thus war and violence involve not only destruction but also a forcible and coercive imposition of a solution which is bound to create a reaction which will explode one day.

Moreover, now that the science of war and violence has evolved nuclear weapons and missiles of distant delivery, and chemical as well as biological war weapons are not far distant, the result of any major war is likely to be the total destruction of both the parties to the war. Such a war may involve the destruction of the whole of humanity and human civilization itself. This can neither be the dream of humanity nor can human conscience subscribe to it. If conscious human planning and human effort have to have their way, it is clear that they are on the side of peaceful efforts for solving conflicts, such as the UNO and so on. The human conscience as expressed through the greatest of thinkers, past and present, is for peace, love and har-

mony and against all war and violence.

Since human social evolution is going on along the path of truth and love and peace and not along the road of falsehood and hate and war, it is obvious that satyāgraha is in tune with the trend which subscribes primarily to construction, to truth, to love, to peaceful ways, to persuasion rather than coercion, to friendliness and cooperation rather than to isolation. Therefore, every step taken towards the discovery of truth through love and nonviolence, every attempt at establishing truth through nonviolent and persuasive means, every attempt at non-coercive conversion of the opponent by love and service, leads us along the path of human social evolution and every step contrary to these is anti-evolutionary and obstructive in character.

CHAPTER 21

SATYĀGRAHA—INDIVIDUAL AND DOMESTIC

I have so far dealt with the principles and theory of satyāgraha as well as its history and technique. The following chapters deal with the practice of satyāgraha in its varied forms. Satyāgraha even today is but an experiment; it is an art which is still in the process of evolution and its author himself says that it is a 'science in the making'. It will remain so for some more time to come.

The best elucidation of its technique can come only from its author, and a study of Gandhi's methods in the practice of individual and domestic satyāgraha, and more important still, a study of the mass movements which were launched under his leadership, will prove most helpful to a student of this science and art.

In his autobiography, Gandhi gives us revealing pictures of his early attempts at satyāgraha, and the incidents which he recalls show how he reacted to evil or injustice either in himself or in persons whom he considered to be members of his own family.



In his schooldays, when he was about fifteen, he along with his brother fell a prey to common vices like smoking. The brother contracted debts and to liquidate them Mohandas helped his brother to sell a piece of gold from off his armlet to a goldsmith. But the sense of guilt sat heavily upon him, and in remorse he wrote a letter to his father making a frank confession and inviting upon himself the fullest penalty for his action. Mohandas's father was moved to tears by his son's confession. Gandhi writes: 'Those pearl-drops of love cleansed me of the sin'.



The first experiment in domestic satyāgraha, which involved a fast, was undertaken by Gandhi in South Africa in 1913. It was in the nature of a penance for the moral lapse of two of his colleagues in the Phoenix Park. Gandhi felt that he was partly responsible for their fall since it happened in his āśram. He went on a four days' fast and then took only one meal a day for the next four and a half

months, as an act of self-purification and *tapas*. The atmosphere of the āśram chastened as a result.



Another instance concerned Kasturba. In 1909 she was having haemorrhage which did not subside even after advanced allopathic treatment. Gandhi took the patient in his hands and prescribed that she should not take salt and pulses for some time. Kasturba, who had no great faith in her husband's medical abilities, refused to follow Gandhi's instructions. When he insisted, the exasperated Kasturba taunted that even he would not give up salt if he was asked to do so by his doctors. This was a challenge and Gandhi took it up. He said that he would not touch salt and pulses for a year. Kasturba, who did not relish the prospect of her husband undergoing an ordeal for her sake, implored him to desist from taking such a vow, but Gandhi stuck to his words, and that too for ten years instead of one! Kasturba followed Gandhi's example for a year; it certainly improved her health and Gandhi was not the worse for the abstinence either! In his autobiography, he refers to this incident as one of the sweetest recollections of his life.



Gandhi resorted to the method of satyāgraha in his individual capacity also against strangers or the powers-that-be. Within a week of his arrival in Durban, he had to go to Pretoria. A part of the journey had to be performed in a coach and four. Then as now racialism was running riot in South Africa. Gandhi was not given a seat inside the coach as some white men were sitting there. He took his seat on the box beside the coachman. Some time during the journey the guard who wanted to smoke ordered Gandhi to vacate that seat and sit at his feet. Gandhi refused to do so. The guard flew into a rage and struck Gandhi in the face. But Gandhi would not give in and stuck to his seat clutching at the railing. Another blow nearly knocked him down. At this point other passengers in the coach intervened and saved Gandhi. It was characteristic of the satyāgrahī in Gandhi that he bore no ill-will towards the guard who had treated him so cruelly, nor did he contemplate any retaliation or legal proceedings against him.



On yet another occasion Gandhi stuck fast to the principles of satyāgraha even when he very nearly fell a victim to organized mob fury. This was when he returned to Durban in 1894 after a brief sojourn in India. During his absence, a campaign of vilification was launched in South Africa. It was alleged that while in India he carried on propaganda to blacken the record of the South African whites. Another charge was that he was plotting to flood South Africa with Indians. Mob fury was worked up on these fantastic charges, with the result that when Gandhi landed in Durban a crowd of 3,000 Europeans nearly lynched him. It was through the good offices of a European lady—Mrs Alexander, wife of the Superintendent of Police, Durban—that Gandhi was saved. On this occasion too Gandhi refused to proceed legally against anyone. The mob, he maintained, was misled and was bound to see the error of its way in course of time.



There have been occasions when even some of his own followers figured in the role of the offenders. One such incident happened in South Africa when Mir Alim, a trusted friend, almost bludgeoned Gandhi to death for voluntarily giving his finger-prints—a practice against which he had launched one of the earliest satyāgrahas, but which he had acquiesced in after receiving satisfactory assurances from General Smuts. Gandhi refused to take action against Mir Alim and did not appear even as a witness when the Government proceeded against Mir Alim of its own accord. Mir Alim later became one of his staunchest followers again.

Instances like these which prove the latent power of satyāgraha can be multiplied; but these typical ones picked up almost at random give an idea of the essential characteristics that constitute this novel method of resisting evil by good, of meeting brute force with spiritual strength.

SATYĀGRAHA CAMPAIGNS BY GANDHI

In South Africa

The first mass satyāgraha—and the most important, in historical perspective—was launched by Gandhi in South Africa to fight the organized discrimination of the South African whites against Indians who had settled there. The movement attracted world-wide attention. As it was initiated and led throughout by Gandhi and as he practically evolved his method and technique during the campaign, it is worth studying in detail.

In South Africa at that time, as even now, there were a number of social and legal grievances. Most of them were the result of race-prejudice, colour-bar, and the jealousy of the European settlers. All Indians, except those Mohammedans who preferred to be called Arabs, were called 'coolies', because indentured coolies were the first Indians that the Europeans there had come across. Gandhi himself was called a 'coolie barrister'. In fact the Natal Law Society opposed his being enrolled as a barrister on the ground that he was coloured! However, the objection was not upheld. Indians were not allowed to enter railway stations by the main gates. Difficulties were placed in the way of their getting higher class tickets. If they got tickets, they would not get accommodation in the higher class compartments as few Europeans would tolerate them as fellow passengers. They were likely to be thrown out at any time or be asked to shift to the lower class. That they also had paid for the higher class was no consideration.

Then in addition to these prejudices and racial jealousies, there were the discriminatory 'black laws'. Every ex-indentured Indian labourer had to pay a poll-tax of £3 if he wished to settle down there, and a similar amount for his wife and for every son and daughter above sixteen. None could trade without a licence. Europeans got licences merely for the asking, while Indians experienced great difficulties in getting them. Then there was the Education Test Act, according to which an immigrant was obliged to pass a test in one of the European languages. Those who had settled three years earlier

were, however, exempt from the operation of this Act. Even while the agitation against the Asiatic Registration Bill of 1906 was on, the Transvaal Immigrants Registration Act was passed in 1907, which practically closed the door for any new Indian immigrant even if he passed the language test.

While agitation was being carried on through the Natal Congress, founded in 1894, and similar bodies in Transvaal and Cape Town, and through the columns of the journal, *Indian Opinion*, Gandhi had not neglected what may be called the 'internal improvement programme' of the Indian community. That was his constructive programme in those days. It included such items as domestic sanitation, separate buildings for residence and for shops, education, etc.

Ultimately the storm gathered round the Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance. Gandhi first read it in the *Transvaal Government Gazette Extraordinary* of 22 July 1906. Reverend Joseph J. Doke writes as follows about it:

For some eighteen months, the Asiatic community which numbered about ten thousand throughout Transvaal, naturally a loyal and law-abiding community, has been in revolt against the Government. The Asiatic Law Amendment Act, which was based on the theory that the Asiatics had inaugurated a widespread fraudulent traffic in 'permits' and was consequently a criminal community, to be legislated against as criminals, awakened intense indignation amongst them. They clamoured for proof of this traffic, but were refused. They appealed to have the charges investigated by a Judge of the Supreme Court, but the appeal was ignored. They had no parliamentary vote, and no representative in Parliament, so nothing remained but either to give outward sign of the criminal in registration—which was the impression of the digits—or resist the law. They decided on resistance. Fortunately, their leader was a refined, gentle, chivalrous man, a disciple of Tolstoy and the resistance took the form of Passive Resistance. . . . I said yesterday to him, 'My friend, it is likely to be a long struggle—England is careless, and the Government here is like iron.' He replied, 'It does not matter. If the trial is long, my people will be purified by it, and victory is sure to come.'

Commenting on this piece of legislation, Gandhi said: 'I have never known legislation of this nature being directed against free men in any part of the world. . . . There are some drastic laws directed against (so-called) criminal tribes in India, with which this Ordinance

can be easily compared. . . . Finger-prints are required by law only from criminals. I was, therefore, shocked by this compulsory requirement regarding finger-prints.'

After deep thought and excited debates, the Indian community took the decision in a crowded meeting of three thousand delegates held in Johannesburg on 11 September 1906 to resist the insulting Ordinance. An oath was administered to each delegate to resist the law at all costs.

Preliminary to actual resistance, the usual petitions, deputations, interviews and correspondence were carried on. But Mr Duncan, the Colonial Secretary, told them definitely that the Government deemed the Ordinance essential for the existence of the Europeans there.

Thus the stage was set. Refusal to register, to give finger-prints, and to receive permits was the form which satyāgraha was to take. Satyāgrahīs were to get ready to suffer the consequences of their refusal to obey the law.

The 1st of July 1907 saw the opening of the permit offices of the Government, in accordance with the new Ordinance. Gandhi organized peaceful picketing of the offices. Even boys of twelve enrolled themselves as pickets. Though some five hundred persons registered and took permits, the Government could not proceed further and decided to arrest the organizers and resisters.

The crisis came in December 1907 when notices were issued against prominent members of the Indian community to appear before the Court and show cause why they had not yet registered. Many including Gandhi were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. But on 30 January 1908, promises were given by General Smuts and as a result of some settlement, Gandhi, along with some other important members, was released. General Smuts promised to repeal the Ordinance and validate registration provided the Indians registered voluntarily. Indians did their part. The leaders did it even at the risk of being misunderstood by their followers. But General Smuts did not fulfil his part of the agreement and broke the promises he had made previously. The Ordinance was not repealed. He did not even give satisfactory replies to Gandhi's letters. On the other hand, another bill was introduced effectively barring all further Indian immigration. That bill later passed into law.

The resumption on the struggle became inevitable. A meeting of the delegates was called at Johannesburg on 16 September 1908, when a big bonfire of the certificates, which had been taken out voluntarily

in pursuance of the settlement, was planned. Two thousand certificates were flung into the fire that day.

Then began the long and arduous struggle when fines, imprisonments, hard labour and hardships, harassment, insults, flogging and even firing were the resisters' lot. On 13 March 1913, a High Court judgement invalidated all Indian marriages as being not in accord with the local law. This was a brazen insult to Indian women who were stung to the quick and joined the struggle. All those who were inmates of the Phoenix Park crossed over to Transvaal in a batch of sixteen and they were sentenced. Some Tamil ladies who were not arrested went to the mines and roused the labourers there against the iniquities of the £3 tax. This agitation finally culminated in the great march of 2,037 men, 127 women, and 57 children across the border of Transvaal on the morning of 6 November 1913. Then came the arrests of Gandhi, Polak and others. The 'invaders' of Transvaal were all arrested and sentenced, and made to work in the mines. In the meanwhile, the strike-wave spread to other mines. Hardships were heaped upon the satyāgrahīs.

At last the position of the Union Government became intolerable and they announced the appointment of a Commission to give relief to the Indian community. Gandhi, Kallenbach, and Polak were released on 18 December 1913. Other prisoners were released within the next few days. By the end of July 1914 the Indian Relief Bill was passed. It repealed the £3 tax, validated Hindu and Mussalman religious marriages (only one wife being recognized as legal) and recognized the domicile certificate as conclusive evidence of citizenship.

Thus ended the struggle which was spread over a period of eight long years (1906-1914) and made new history by revolutionizing the method of fighting for social justice.

The story, however brief, would not be complete without a mention of the acts of chivalry which distinguished the conduct of the satyāgrahīs during the struggle. In every step that he takes the satyāgrahī is bound to consider the position of the adversary, says Gandhi. The opponents' difficulty is never the satyāgrahī's opportunity, and a satyāgrahī would go out of his way to help the opponent in his difficulties. Satyāgrahīs in South Africa acted up to this precept as the following instances will clearly show.

When labourers in the North Coast went on strike, the planters at Mount Edgecombe would have suffered heavy losses if the sugar-cane

that had been cut was not brought to the mills and crushed. So twelve hundred Indians returned to the mills to finish this piece of work and then resumed the strike.

On another occasion when the Indian employees of the Durban Municipality struck work, those who were engaged in the sanitary services of the Borough or as attendants on the patients in the hospitals were sent back to their duties so that there might be no outbreak of epidemics in the city, and the sick might not suffer.

The most notable example of such chivalry was seen on the occasion of the great strike of the European employees of the Union Railways. The Government was really embarrassed. It was suggested to Gandhi to strike the blow which would prove decisive. But Gandhi refused to do so. It would be contrary to the spirit of satyāgraha, he argued. This decision was very widely appreciated and one of the secretaries to General Smuts said to Gandhi: 'I do not like your people and do not care to assist them at all. But what am I to do? You help us in our days of need. How can we lay hands upon you? I often wish you took to violence like the English strikers, and then we would know at once how to dispose of you. But you will not injure even the enemy. You desire victory by self-suffering alone and never transgress your self-imposed limits of courtesy and chivalry. And that is what reduces us to sheer helplessness.'

There cannot be a better description of the psychological effect of satyāgraha upon an opponent.

The satyāgraha in South Africa also brings out the important differences indicated in an earlier chapter, between mere passive resistance—which is admittedly the weapon of the weak—and satyāgraha proper which springs out of the unswerving pursuit of truth through love even of the opponent and out of inner strength. Gandhi in this case insisted that truth and justice were on his side and that he would establish it without ill-will and by self-suffering. He never thought of harassing the opponent. A mere passive-resister would have acted quite differently.

Champaran

Champaran is a name to conjure with in the history of satyāgraha in India. For the first time Gandhi disobeyed the fiat of the authorities and said that he would not be ordered about in his own country. That was the beginning of his new method in India. The statement he submitted to the Court at Champaran rings true today

and will ever remain an inspiring document. 'That day', Gandhi says, 'was an unforgettable event in my life and a red-letter day for the peasants (of Champaran) and for me'. It was India's first object lesson in Civil Disobedience.

It was during the session of the Congress in Lucknow in December 1916 that Gandhi came to know of the age-long sufferings of the Champaran peasants. A worker from Bihar, Kishore Babu, after acquainting Gandhi with the local conditions invited him to visit the place, which he did in April 1917.

Champaran, reputed to be the kingdom of the great king Janaka, is a district of the north-western corner of Bihar. European planters who had reaped rich harvests from the indigo plantations there, had been exploiting the simple peasantry for nearly a century. They had practically set up a super-government with the aid of legislation and usage, and sometimes by naked force. The Executive of the government which was sympathetic to this planter-raj, turned down all pleas for relief made by local leaders on behalf of the peasants and even recourse to legal action proved ineffective in the face of Executive hostility. The planters, entrenched under the Bengal Tenancy Act and similar reactionary laws, exploited the poor peasants with impunity.

The main grievance of the peasants was in regard to the 'tinkanthia' contract. 'Tinkanthia', which literally means 'three sticks', had an ominous significance to the peasantry. Each tenant was compelled to cultivate indigo in three-twentieths of his holding, whether it was profitable for him or not. Sometimes the proportion was raised five-twentieths. This indefensible extortion was legalized by the Bengal Tenancy Act. When the cultivation of indigo became unprofitable on account of the advent of the synethetic substitute, the planters entered into new agreements with the peasants, relieving them from the obligation to grow indigo, but on condition that they paid enhanced rents. Here too the Bengal Tenancy Act came to the aid of the planters who quoted sections in the Act in support of their action. This procedure was adopted only in places where the planters had permanent lease of the lands, and thus would be entitled to the increased rent for ever. In the interior, there were places where the European planters were only temporary lessees. In such places, the permanent owners stood to benefit by an increase in rents as they would also get it when the period of temporary lease was over. To avoid such a contingency, European planters extorted cash payments from the tenants to release them from the obligation to grow indigo.

The fact that in most of the villages the barbarous 'tinkanthia' contract had no legal existence did not prevent the planters from extracting the money.

The methods they adopted to extort money out of the peasants would blacken any civilized record. Beating and shutting up the peasants in temporary prisons, impounding the cattle, looting houses, stopping the service of barbers, washermen and chamārs, preventing people from getting in or out of their houses, were only some of the ways which the planters adopted to terrorize the recalcitrant. Many illegal levies were collected on various occasions. There was a tax on marriages, a tax on oil-mills and a tax on every house. If the 'Sahib' chose to go to a hill-station to escape the sweltering heat of the plains, the peasants had to meet his master's fare, and tax called 'paparhi' had to be paid by each tenant. If the Sahib needed a car, a horse or an elephant, it was the peasant who had to pay for it through a tax. Besides these, heavy fines used to be imposed on peasants, if any offence was committed against any of the Sahibs. The influence of the planters with the Government and the officials was so great that the peasants dared not approach either the judicial or the executive authorities.

It is said that the planters made about twelve lakhs of rupees through these iniquitous levies, and thus, at the cost of the poor peasant, made good the losses they suffered during the slump in the indigo trade.

The peasants direly needed deliverance from the tyranny of the planters but knew not from where it could come.

It was in these circumstances that Gandhi was invited to visit Champaran.²

He reached Motihari, the headquarters of the district, on 17 April 1917. Immediately on arrival, he saw the authorities and told them what he had planned to do. He saw the Secretary of the Planters' Association as well. Both of them were, of course, unsympathetic. However, as was his wont, Gandhi wanted to study the case in detail and on the spot. He wished to assure himself of the truth of the grievances and of the allegations against the planters. He was about to proceed to a village for this, when he was served with an order under Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code to quit the district, on the obviously false plea that there would be a disturbance of peace if he remained in the district.

Who was the magistrate to order him about in his own country?

—Gandhi asked himself and decided to disregard the order. He courteously intimated to the magistrate his intention. He wrote to him to say that he had come in search of information—he wanted to inquire into the grievances of the poor peasants and he had no intention of leaving the district before finishing his task. He said he would stand his trial for disobeying the order, but the burden of removing him from the people whom he had come to serve would fall on the Government. He was summoned to the Court and he submitted a statement pleading guilty of the charge of disobedience of the magisterial order. He said he was obeying a higher law, the law of his conscience. Judgement was never delivered against him and later the case was withdrawn.

Meanwhile he had continued with his inquiry. The C.I.D. people were generally in attendance when statements were being taken. As many as twenty thousand statements were submitted, and the case for the peasants was based on them. Their demands were formulated. Later the Governor of the Province took interest in the inquiry and the Government appointed a Commission of Inquiry with Gandhi as the member representing the peasants. The Commission came to the unanimous conclusion that the 'tinkanthia' and all other illegal levies should be abolished, and recommended a partial refund of exactions from tenants.

In the early stages of the inquiry, the planters were hostile and the Government backed them up. But Gandhi's readiness to disobey the magistrate's order and his persistence in following his own course to find out the truth surprised them and to a great extent confounded them. No occasion arose for the peasants to resort to satyāgraha. The satyāgraha of a single individual, of Gandhi, was sufficient to rouse the conscience of India and to open the eyes of the provincial Government to the iniquities involved. The peasants, it must be said to their credit, kept the peace, came up boldly and gave evidence, and above all, prepared themselves to follow Gandhi wherever he chose to lead them.

What was it that Gandhi demanded in the first instance? He insisted on his simple right to inquire into the grievances of his fellow-countrymen, the suffering peasantry of Champaran. The Government could neither suppress such a simple right nor could they neglect the inquiry once it had begun.

It is interesting to study how Gandhi proceeded in this case. He was very cautious at the beginning. He did not readily consent to

go. But once he made up his mind, he went into the struggle wholeheartedly, and risked his liberties from the outset. When some people suggested that he should seek legal remedies against the planters, he brushed aside the suggestion saying that law courts were no good and not useful in the circumstances. Instead of avoiding the planters, he straightaway interviewed the Secretary of their Association and explained to him his mission. He civilly disobeyed the magistrate's order and went about as if no order existed. When he saw that he would be spending some time there for the ensuing fight, he took the opportunity to do some constructive work as well. He caused some six primary schools to be started in villages and made arrangements for medical relief. He wanted to teach the villagers to live better and healthier lives. When teachers and doctors were not available locally, he got them from outside and laid the foundation for further constructive activity and disinterested village service. He warned the teachers and doctors not to concern themselves with the economic and political problems. He cared more for the moral fibre of his teachers than for their intellectual attainments. For instance, he enrolled Kasturba as one of the teachers. When she pleaded that she could not teach reading and writing, he exhorted her to teach cleanliness and better manners rather than the three Rs, which were not, after all, the most important thing. He had become convinced that work of a permanent nature was impossible without village education.

The campaign lasted for about six months, by which time the labours of the Inquiry Committee came to an end. The recommendations of the Committee were embodied in an Act which swept off the iniquities of a century. Later when indigo went out of vogue, most of the European planters left the district and the few that remained began to live like any other local landholder.

'Today', writes Babu Rajendra Prasad, 'the peasant of Champaran is as free as any other man in India can be in the present conditions to develop and improve himself and his surroundings'.

The Kheda Satyāgraha

In Champaran, Gandhi was able to achieve results comparatively easily. In Kheda, where peasants were struck by famine, they had to launch a regular civil disobedience campaign with all the sacrifices such a movement involves, even to attain a limited objective. This happened in 1918.

The district of Kheda or Kaira is in Gujarat. The crops had

failed and semi-famine conditions prevailed. The peasants were unable to pay the assessment for the year. They were entitled to a suspension of the tax under the rules which laid down that if the annewari estimate of the crops showed that the peasants could realize only one-fourth of the normal yield, they should be relieved from the obligation of paying the assessment that year. But the Government refused to grant this legitimate relief. Petitions, representations, and resolutions in the Provincial Council were of no avail.

Gandhi then appeared on the scene. After studying the situation, he advised the people to withhold payment. The people responded nobly and took an oath that they would rather lose their land than pay what was not rightly due. Even those who could afford to pay refused to pay the taxes, in sympathy with their poorer brethren.

Gandhi put before the public and the Government the peasant's case and appealed for justice. He enlisted volunteers to work in the district and keep up the morale of the peasants. Vallabhbhai Patel, then a rising barrister in Ahmedabad, joined the struggle.

A systematic education of the peasantry began. Their fear of officialdom was wiped away. They were taught that officials were really their servants and they had no business to order them about. This emboldened the peasants to stand up to the officials and defy threats of coercion and intimidation. The peasants, however, were asked to be civil in the face of the gravest provocation. They faced all attachments of property and notices for forfeiture of their land with equanimity.

An occasion for civil disobedience was provided by the Government. An onion-field was attached. The attachment was bad in law. So Gandhi advised one Mohanlal Pandya and some seven or eight of his followers to reap the crop. They did so, and were arrested and imprisoned. This only strengthened the morale of the people and all fear of imprisonment disappeared.

When the officials saw that the people refused to yield, they began to beat a hasty retreat, but without openly announcing any concession for or negotiating with the peasants. They ceased to press those who were unable to pay. The attachments and notices stopped. Thus they tacitly recognized the contention of the people that relief should be granted to those who were unable to pay.

In principle, the satyāgraha was successful but lacked the essentials of a complete triumph. The Government did not meet in full

them. The people did not feel the glow of immediate success nor did they realize the benefit they had gained. Gandhi remarked that 'the end is worthy only when it leaves the satyāgrahīs stronger and more spirited than in the beginning'. He saw that the people felt frustrated and dejected and that they were not civil enough towards the authorities. Moreover, the Government had succeeded in dividing the ranks of the people by discrimination in realizing the assessment.

But the indirect results that followed were valuable. There was widespread awakening among the peasantry in Gujarat. In fact, they shed their lethargy and they learnt the lesson of self-reliance and self-confidence. For the first time they realized that they had certain fundamental rights which they could enforce by mass action.

Referring to this campaign Gandhi says in his autobiography: 'The lesson was indelibly imprinted on the public mind that the salvation of the people depends upon themselves, upon their capacity for suffering and sacrifice. Through the Kheda campaign, satyāgraha took firm root in the soil of Gujarat.'

It was the first occasion on which Gandhi called upon the masses of India to face hardships and sufferings and educated them on the lines of satyāgraha, and they did that very successfully.

After the campaign, Gandhi saw the necessity of training volunteers to educate the ryots in the science of satyāgraha and he also felt that the peaceful side or the constructive aspect of satyāgraha had not yet become sufficiently attractive to the people. But he could not get enough men immediately to do that type of work, so that the actual progress in that direction was not up to his expectation.

Satyāgraha by Labourers

While Kheda was still engaging Gandhi's attention a dispute between the textile millowners and labourers of Ahmedabad came to the fore.

Though the difference between the parties concerned began with the dispute about the grant of a bonus, ultimately the issue revolved round the percentage of dearness allowances. When both the parties approached Gandhi, he studied the whole case and persuaded them to agree to arbitration. That was done, but unfortunately after a few days some misunderstanding arose amongst some of the millhands and they went on strike. This angered the millowners who were waiting for an excuse to get out of the agreement. They declared a lock-out on 22 February 1918. Gandhi pleaded with the

millowners as well as the workers but to no purpose. He saw that the labourers were, on the whole, in the right. When the lock-out became an accomplished fact, he advised the labourers to demand a 35 per cent increase in the allowance which he considered reasonable. The millowners had, however, decided not go beyond 20 per cent. Then began a regular strike from the 26th of February 1918 in which thousands of labourers were involved.

The labourers took a simple oath: They would not go to work in the mills till a 35 per cent increase was given to them on their July pay. They would not create any trouble during the days of lock-out and would observe perfect nonviolence. They would not indulge in any assault or looting. They would not harm in any way the property of the millowners. They would not allow any indecent words to escape their lips. They would maintain absolute peace.

During the lock-out, Gandhi kept himself and his co-workers busy. His co-workers visited the quarters of the labourers and gave instructions regarding clean and healthy living, and rendered medical aid and other help. Every day educative bulletins were issued for distribution among the labourers. There were also daily meetings where the day-to-day problems were tackled.

Gandhi is very strict about monetary help. He does not believe in a campaign run on the strength of money. He exhorted every one to find work for himself and to live on his own earnings. Many were temporarily employed for building the āśram which was under construction. At the same time Gandhi assured the labourers every day that if it should happen that starvation was in prospect, he would starve first, and not they.

The morale of the labourers remained splendid for about a fortnight. In the meantime some of the millowners were trying their tricks. Numerous rumours were circulated, and the mill-hands seemed to be wavering and losing morale. It was at this time that Gandhi took one of those sudden decisions which was at once striking and original. He said he would neither take food nor use a car till he saw the end of it all.

Here are his own words: 'Instead of five to ten thousand blooming faces full of the lustre of iron determination, I saw but a thousand or two who seemed worn out and dejected. . . . I am one of those who believe that one has to stick to his vow in any circumstances. I cannot even for a moment tolerate the idea that you should violate the solemn pledge you have taken. Till such time as you would all

get your 35 per cent increment or you are all completely defeated in your object, I am not going to touch my food nor am I riding a car.'

This turned the scales. The labourers again became adamant. The fast brought an indirect pressure on the millowners and Gandhi said that to that extent it had an element of coercion in it. But he said that he could not help it as that was the only remedy he could devise for saving the labourers from a fall.

It was finally decided that Professor Dhruva should act as the sole arbitrator. After a period of three months he decided that an increment of 35 per cent on their July pay should be given to the mill-hands.

In this case, Gandhi's active nonviolence, that is his love for the cause of the mill-hands of Ahmedabad was so intense that he risked his own life for it. After about a fortnight's struggle, when he took to fasting and thus maintained the morale of the labourers and hastened the settlement, Miss Ferring, a Danish lady in a telegram to Gandhi said: 'Greater love knoweth no man than that he lay down his life for the sake of his fellowmen'.

Gandhi remarked at the end of the struggle that there was no place for hatred or ill-will in it and that he was as much the servant of the millowners as of the labourers. Shri Mahadev Desai who has written a small book in Gujarati on this struggle, called *Dharma Yuddha*, has characterized the strike as one conducted with the cleanest means, on the strength of sheerest determination, and with the least bitterness on both sides. The result too was beneficial to both parties.

The work thus begun among the labourers of Ahmedabad has continued to this day and the Textile Labour Union of Ahmedabad is one of the most closely-knit organizations in the country. It works along the lines laid down by Gandhi.

Vykom Satyāgraha

Below are given some campaigns not directly conducted by Gandhi but blessed by him.

Vykom is a big village in Travancore, now Kerala State. The ancient temple of Śiva in the village gives it some importance. The temple is in the centre of the village. There is a public road which goes along the brahmin quarters and passes the temple as well. For centuries, the priests and the brahmins did not allow untouchables to

go that way. Some enthusiastic reformers set their hearts to get the road thrown open to all human beings alike, by the methods of satyāgraha. Three people, Madhavan, Krishnaswami and Kelappan started the campaign early in 1924.

Gandhi had recently come out of jail and he was not enjoying normal health. He was still suffering from the after-effects of the operation for appendicitis. Yet when the workers consulted him, Gandhi gave them his blessings and they had the advantage of his guidance from time to time.

The Travancore Government sided with the orthodox section and gave them police aid for guarding the road. The issue thus boiled down to a demand for the right of way to all citizens along a public road.

When the first batch tried to pass by the road, it was severely beaten by the priests and the brahmins. One of the group was seriously hurt. The batch was a mixed one and it consisted of some reformers and some untouchables. But the reformers were undeterred by the beating they received. Ungrudgingly and without harbouring any thought either of retaliation or violence, they persisted in their efforts daily. Several of them were arrested and imprisoned for trespass.

The story of their struggle spread far and wide and their enthusiasm proved infectious. Volunteers began to pour in from distant places and provinces to take the place of those who had been arrested. The State authorities then stopped arresting the satyāgrahis. They ordered barricades to be erected across the road and asked the police to form cordons there. Gandhi then instructed the volunteers not to rush through the barricades but to stand in front of them in a prayerful attitude and to keep vigil day and night. The volunteers erected a small hut nearby, organized shifts of six hours and took to their duties almost with a religious zeal. In spare hours they took to spinning. They did not contemplate any violence at any time to the police on duty, to the State authorities, to the priests or to the brahmins. Nor did they think of rushing or destroying the barricades.

This state of affairs continued to prevail for a pretty long time. Then the rains came. The road where the satyāgrahis were keeping vigil was flooded. But the volunteers did not flinch. Sometimes they stood in shoulder-deep water. They changed the shifts to three hours but still continued their watch. The police had to form cordons in

small canoes.

This prolonged satyāgraha and the silent suffering of the volunteers made the issue an all-India one. Gandhi himself visited the place in April 1925. He had some talks with the Travancore authorities. They were exhorted not to uphold orthodoxy by sheer physical force. Ultimately they were persuaded to withdraw the police pickets and remove the barricades. In the autumn of 1925, after a year and four months of satyāgraha the road was cleared and the opposition of the brahmins broke down. Possibly if the State had not gone to the aid of the priests, the problem would have been solved much earlier.

Later the Maharaja of Travancore by a Royal Proclamation in 1937 threw open the doors of all State temples to all Hindu citizens alike, irrespective of caste or creed. Gandhi visited Vykombathur once more at that time. He referred to this satyāgraha in his speech there (18 January 1937) and said that 'only a few years ago a hard struggle had to be launched in order to allow avarna Hindus to pass by the road. And now the temples themselves are thrown open to all!'

An Unwanted Statue

The story of the satyāgraha for the removal of Neill's statue in Madras is very interesting. This started about the 1st of September 1927. A statue of Neill had been erected in Madras in the middle of the last century. He was killed at the relief of Lucknow in India's bid for independence in 1857. Even according to British evidence, Neill was a brutal man and was responsible for a number of atrocities. A statue in his honour recalled all the indignities and insults heaped upon the people by him. It was natural, therefore, that an agitation should be started for the removal of a symbol which recalled such painful memories.

A number of people began to offer satyāgraha by advancing towards the statue with a hammer and chisel in hand. The police kept guard and arrested the volunteers who came near the statue. Gandhi blessed the movement and wrote some articles in his weekly, *Young India*, giving directions to the volunteers. In one of them he said: 'The volunteers must not be impatient. Impatience is a phase of violence. A satyāgrahī has nothing to do with victory. He is sure of it, but he has also to know that it comes from God. He is but to suffer.' He criticized the violent language of some of the leaflets issued by the volunteers. He said: 'There is no room for the

language of anger and hate. We seek to destroy the principle for which the statue stands. We wish to injure no man!

Some thirty volunteers were sentenced. But the satyāgraha did not continue for long and it may be said that it failed in its immediate objective. Later when Congress ministries took office, one of the first things that Shri Rajagopalachari, the Chief Minister, did was to have the statue removed to the Museum!

Bardoli Satyāgraha

All the satyāgraha campaigns in India so far described pale into insignificance before the epic struggle waged by the peasantry of Bardoli. The issues involved were of utmost importance to the whole of the ryotwari area. The bureaucracy also applied all its force to crush the movement and yielded only when they saw that it was impossible to kill the spirit of the people.

If all had gone well in 1922 when the first non-cooperation movement was in full swing, Bardoli tāluk would have been the scene of the fiercest struggle and a place where all the items of the non-cooperation programme would have been put into practice. But the Chauri Chaura incident of violence by Congress volunteers deprived Bardoli of that honour. The no-tax campaign was indefinitely postponed. But later, in 1928, Bardoli fulfilled its destiny, for in that year, it launched the momentous no-tax campaign which is a landmark in the history of satyāgraha.

The Government of Bombay revises once in 30 years the assessment on land in every tāluk. Mostly revision means an increase in the assessment. In the case of Bardoli and Chorasī tāluks they raised it by 30 per cent. Protests brought down the percentage of the increase to 22, but the peasants challenged even this decision and demanded that an open inquiry should be held, before there was any enhancement in the revenue. The Government did not heed the protests.

After much patient deliberation the peasants took the plunge. They held conferences and passed resolutions and gave due notice of their intention to withhold payment in case the Government stuck to its decision.

The population of the tāluk numbered about 88,000 and the revenue demand according to the new scale was about Rs 6,27,000. Gandhi studied the situation and blessed the struggle. At the request of the peasants Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel took up the leadership. He

infused in them the determination to carry on the campaign to the bitter end. The struggle started in grim earnest.

Shri Mahadev Desai has written a full account of this struggle in his *Story of Bardoli*. Some of the facts are recounted here in outline.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel organized the tāluk with German thoroughness. For several years there had been four or five social service centres in the different parts of the tāluk, which were carrying on constructive activities. On the framework of these, sixteen camps were now organized in convenient centres and 250 volunteers were put in charge of these camps. Definite duties were assigned to these volunteers. The whole atmosphere of the tāluk was changed into that of an armed camp. Fighting, sacrifice, fearlessness, defiance were on the lips of everyone. Bulletins both for news and instructions were issued every day. A pledge to remain strictly nonviolent and suffer to the utmost and cheerfully lose all was taken by the peasants. The crucial decision was taken when a representative conference at Bardoli resolved that the revision settlement was arbitrary, unjust, and oppressive and called upon all land-holders to refuse payment of the revised assessment until the Government was prepared to accept the amount of the old assessment in full satisfaction of their dues or until the Government appointed an impartial tribunal to settle the whole question of revision by investigation and inquiry on the spot. This was on 12 February 1928.

Men, women and children ready to make all the sacrifices that satyāgraha might call for, thronged at meetings held by the Sardar. The whole tāluk was electrified in a few days and the atmosphere was that of the old days of 1922.

The Government tried its best to compel payment. It tried flattery, bribery, threats, fines, imprisonment, forfeiture, and lathi-charges. It attempted to divide the communities. Property on a large scale was attached and sold for a song to outsiders as no local buyer came forward. They attached about 1,400 acres of land and sold it by auction. Pathans were employed to threaten people and create an atmosphere of fear. But all this only infused more solidarity in the tāluk. A strong social boycott was imposed on all Government representatives and against those who bought the attached property. But physical necessities were never denied even to the opponents.

The whole of India sympathized with the struggle and looked with admiration on the heroes of Bardoli. Women, no less than men,

took part in the struggle. Several members of the Legislature resigned as a protest against the repressive policy of the Government. The matter was also discussed in the Parliament. The peasants stood firm and nonviolent. After five and a half months' struggle, the Government yielded and the Governor appointed a committee of enquiry. All property that had been attached was restored and village officers who had resigned were reinstated. The Committee found that the complaints of the peasants were substantially true and instead of 22 per cent, they recommended only a $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent increment.

This campaign demonstrated beyond doubt the efficacy of the weapon of satyāgraha. The ryots' cause was just, their case unassailable, and their method nonviolent. At the close of the historic struggle Shrimati Sarojini wrote to Gandhi; 'Your dream was to make Bardoli the perfect example of satyāgraha and Bardoli has fulfilled itself in its own fashion by interpreting and perfecting your dream.'

No-Tax in Sirsi, Siddapur and Hirekerur

The circumstances in which the tāluks of Sirsi, Siddapur and Hirekerur in Karnatak had to withhold payment of land revenue in 1931 were quite similar to those that obtained in Kheda in 1918. It was only a coincidence that this campaign synchronised with the great civil disobedience movement of 1930-1931, which ended with the Gandhi-Irwin pact. This, however, was a disadvantage to the ryots as the officials were prejudiced and attributed political motives to the workers there.

In the beginning of 1931 the three tāluks were caught in the grip of a partial famine. Crops had failed and the price of betel-nut, which is the chief money-crop in the two taluks of Sirsi and Siddapur, registered a steep fall. According to the anna valuation, the crops were less than four annas in the rupee. The peasants therefore demanded the suspension of assessment for the year, but that was turned down. The Government tried to identify the economic movement with the political no-tax campaign which had been launched in the tāluk of Ankola in the district of North Kanara. Though it is true that prominent political workers carried on this movement, the economic grievances were genuine and deserved relief.

Sirsi and Siddapur are up-ghat tāluks in the district of North Kanara, while Hirekerur is a tāluk in Dharwar. The peasants of all the three tāluks had taken great care to proceed constitutionally. They did not want to be mixed up with the political fight. They sent

petitions, held conferences, passed resolutions, approached the district revenue authorities and did everything that was necessary to acquaint all concerned with their difficulties. All these methods failed to remedy the situation. A regular no-tax campaign then began. The Government refused to treat the matter on its merits and was determined to break the back of the ryots. The case of the peasants of Sirsi and Siddapur, however, was strong since as long back as 1923 one Mr Collins, a highly-placed revenue officer, had made an exhaustive economic survey of the two tāluks and had recommended a permanent reduction in their revenues. But the Government chose to be blind to all those facts and they now attributed political motives to what was genuinely an agitation for the redress of economic grievances.

The people of all the three tāluks on their part stuck to their ground; hundreds of attachments were made and the peasants had to suffer many harassments. But they received notices of forfeiture of land calmly and with good grace. Some of the attached property was sold and some land also was auctioned though no local bidders dared to buy it.

When about 700 to 800 attachments had taken place and about 200 notices of forfeiture had been issued in the three tāluks, came the news of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact on 4 March 1931.

Naturally the political no-tax campaign which was in Ankola since January 1931 was immediately withdrawn and ryots were asked to pay the taxes which they did. But in the other three tāluks, the no-tax campaign which was based on considerations other than political, had to be continued. Gandhi was acquainted with the details of the case and he gave permission to carry on the struggle.

Meanwhile, a number of volunteers were convicted for picketing at auction sales and for similar offences in connection with the campaign. Some of them had been served with notices to quit the tāluks. A number of searches in Dhwarwar and Belgaum were made by the police and it was evident that they were contemplating a conspiracy case against those who were supposed to be the leaders of the movement. But ultimately the authorities were convinced that the struggle was based on genuine economic grievances. It is said that Gandhi had to mention this fact to Lord Irwin before the local officials yielded. A settlement was then arrived at between the Revenue Commissioner and the workers in the month of May 1931. Substantial relief was given to the ryots of the Hirekerur tāluk, where the revenue for

the year was suspended. In Sirsi and Siddapur the Government promised to suspend collection from individuals who would apply. But as usual, local officers did not interpret the clause liberally and the poor ryots were again subjected to much hardship. Those undergoing punishment were released and pending cases as well as notices were withdrawn. The movement too was immediately suspended.

Later in November 1931 the Government extended to Sirsi and Siddapur some of the concessions which had been recommended by Mr. Collins in 1923. One of them was the permanent reduction of about Rs 17,000 annually in the land revenue. Though belated, it was some relief to the ryots.

CHAPTER 23

SATYĀGRAHA BY OTHERS

Satyāgraha by Hill Tribes

Now here are some satyāgraha campaigns which were conducted by others. Gandhi had neither the occasion nor the opportunity to conduct them directly or indirectly.

Kotgiri or Kotgarh is a district in the Himalayas to the north of Simla. It is on the highway leading from India to Tibet. The vicious system of 'begār' or impressed labour was in vogue there. The poor cultivators were many a time called away from their fields to sweat hard for very low wages and this told heavily upon their agriculture, which naturally suffered a great deal. They had even to take their cows to the bungalows of 'Sahibs' and sell milk at a cheap rate. Not only Government officials but every European who went to the hills for sport harassed the villagers, taking advantage of this iniquitous custom.

The system was a very old one. But lately there had been some awakening among the poor folk and they protested against this custom. Instead of granting any relief, however, the authorities arrested a local leader, Kapur Singh. People were subjected to a reign of terror. The Simla police were called out. Several tribesmen were arrested or scared away by the threat that machine guns would be used or that they would be jailed for life. It was in such an atmosphere that evidence was collected against Kapur Singh and he was sentenced. This happened in 1921 when the spirit of non-cooperation was in the air throughout India.

After a time, one Mr S.E. Stokes who had settled in the hills and was cultivating an orchard took up the question. He organized a determined opposition to the ancient injustice. He set up a 'Panchayat' or a committee. The people were asked to take oaths to the effect that they would obey the committee implicitly and would speak only through the committee.

Then a carefully worded representation was prepared and sent to the District Commissioner. He took no notice. Other officials were also approached but to no purpose. The system continued, because

the British officials depended upon this for their comfort and convenience. Then the 'Panchayat' notified the Commissioner that if the 'begār' system was not abolished within a specified date, people in the district would refuse to render any kind of service.

This brought down the Commissioner from Simla. He tried the usual method of dividing the people in the villages. He threatened drastic action. Though he summoned several people none was willing to talk to him independently and they all pointed to the 'Panchayat'. Perfect nonviolence was maintained. They refused to provide food or undertake any service to any Government official or European travelling on that section of the road. They demanded with one voice that the vicious system should go first. The struggle had gone on for some months and the crisis was reached when the Commissioner felt it necessary to come down himself. In a few days the demands of the villagers were conceded. Printed circulars were pasted in all prominent places along the road. The kinds of service that could be demanded were strictly limited and the wages were fixed on a reasonable basis. Thus the villagers won a victory by their patience, unity, readiness to suffer and above all by sticking to nonviolence.

Gandhi writing about this struggle in the *Young India* of 21 July 1921 says: 'No Indian is giving such battle to Government as Mr Stokes. He has veritably become the guide, philosopher and friend to the hillmen. The reader should know that begār is going on under the shadow of Simla, under the Viceroy's nose as it were. . . . They must not weaken, but must invite upon their devoted heads the wrath of the authorities and face imprisonment as he [Kapur Singh] did.'

No-Cart Movement in Sirsi

A movement similar to that in Kotagiri put a stop to a similar evil in the North Kanara District in Karnatak. Those again were the days of non-cooperation. A system called 'bitti' obtained in the whole of the District. According to it, carts could be requisitioned by government officials irrespective of the needs or convenience of the cart-owners and that too at very low rates. Sometimes they were taken away for days together and agricultural work suffered very much. A cart, according to these officials, signified not only a cart but a pair of oxen, and a driver. Since the whole of North Kanara District is a forest area and more than two-thirds of it are quite hilly, and since there is not a mile of rail-road in it, transport in those days depended almost solely on carts.

Once, as usual, a petty government peon cast his eye on the cart of a villager for the use of the Collector who was camping at Sirsi. When the cartman refused to submit, the peon began to take possession of it forcibly. In so doing he injured the eye of the bullock which began to bleed. It was 9 p.m. then. Some prominent people wanted to go in a body to the Collector to complain about the whole affair.

It happened that Mr Caddel, the then Commissioner of the Southern Division, was also camping at Sirsi on that day. The complainants by mistake went to Mr Caddel. Mr Caddel unnecessarily lost temper and handled the complainants roughly.

The misbehaviour of Mr Caddel became the talk of the town. The news spread like wild fire and instead of breaking the spirit of the villagers, only emboldened them and created quite a furore not only in Sirsi but in the whole of the district. Without much previous organization the contagion to refuse carts to government servants spread throughout the district and the Government, which was taken by surprise, did not know what to do. A complete boycott of the Commissioner's party followed. It is said that the boycott was not restricted to Sirsi but was even enforced in places which he visited afterwards.

Later the Government abolished the system of 'bitti' and subsidized some carts in each locality so that they might be available for the use of the officers while touring the district. The struggle was a short and swift one and it came to a peaceful and satisfactory end and an evil system was abolished for ever.

The Mulshi Petha Satyāgraha

This was a satyāgraha against a hydro-electric scheme that sought to provide electricity to cities, railways and mills in Bombay, at the cost of submerging about fifty-one villages.

Mulshi Petha is a hilly tract about thirty miles from Poona. In 1920, the Tata Power Company brought forward a scheme of bunding streams and waterways in that tract. The scheme threatened to submerge about fifty-one villages and render 11,000 inhabitants homeless. Though the company contemplated paying compensation, it was in effect useless as any compensation would not really be adequate when thousands had to abandon their ancient hearths and homes. The Mavlas who inhabit those parts are hardy cultivators and many of them were the descendants of the brave soldiers who

fought in Shivaji's armies.

The Mavlas were naturally upset by the proposal and they consulted Congress leaders in Poona. Those again were the days when the campaign of non-cooperation raged furiously. The Congress leaders were ready to launch satyāgraha if the Mavlas were prepared to face all the consequences. One thousand and three hundred of them signed a pledge that they would either keep the land to themselves or die in the attempt to retain it. The whole of Maharashtra was agitated over the matter. On Ramanavami, 16 April 1921, the struggle was formally launched. A thousand and two hundred Mavlas, men, women and children, and some prominent Maharashtra leaders went and sat on the side of the dam that was being constructed. Five thousand labourers who were working there struck work. This went on for a month. Everything was done quite nonviolently. The move was successful in its immediate objective since the Company stopped the construction altogether for the time being. Then the monsoon began.

The Mavlas, like the peasants elsewhere in India, were heavily indebted to the savkārs or the money-lenders. The latter believed that if satyāgraha went on they would get less compensation. Therefore behind the back of the satyāgrahis the money-lenders opened negotiations with the Engineers and the Manager of the Company. Liberal compensation was promised by the Manager provided there was no outbreak of satyāgraha again. But in spite of attempts by the money-lenders to wean them away, the Mavlas stuck to their determination not to leave their homeland. The struggle went on for another two years and a half. Finally the Government acquired the land under the Land Acquisition Act. Now the peasants had the Company, the money-lenders, and the Government ranged against them. Some of the peasants joined the opposite side and added to their difficulties. Dissensions among the leaders were another handicap.

The second part of the campaign started in December 1921. Arrests, convictions, intimidation, oppression went on merrily. Most of the important Maharashtra leaders courted arrest. In all about 125 Mavlas, 500 volunteers, many of the leaders and a number of women were imprisoned. When the important leaders were behind prison bars the money-lenders came on the scene with the help of the dissenting leaders they persuaded many Mavlas to accept enhanced compensation. This demoralized the whole struggle, which had to be abandoned, since they in whose interest and for whose benefit the

struggle was being carried on, had given way.

Though compensation was paid on a very liberal scale, it was hardly any consolation as a large percentage of it went into the pockets of the money-lenders.

Borsad Satyāgraha

Borsad is a tāluk in Kheda District in the province of Gujarat. In 1922, some time after the incarceration of Mahatma Gandhi, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was called upon to lead a small satyāgraha campaign in that tāluk and the peasants were ordered to bear the cost.

For some time one Devar Baba was very active in this area, committing dacoities, kidnapping rich people and extorting handsome ransoms. This went on for a month. Then a rival Muslim dacoit appeared on the scene and he too carried on similar activities in the same tāluk at the same time. The police found themselves helpless against both. Borsad tāluk butted into the Baroda State territory and the police there were equally upset. But even their joint efforts were of no avail.

Then, secretly and without the knowledge of the higher officials, the police and the revenue authorities of the locality devised a plan. The services of the Muslim outlaw were sought to get hold of Devar Baba. The proposition was found acceptable to the rival, who, however, imposed a condition that he should be given more arms and the help of half a dozen constables.

When this was acceded to, the clever outlaw increased his activities with this additional force and the comparative immunity he enjoyed helped him a great deal. The police were completely taken in and crime increased. Then the Government came down on the villagers themselves saying that they were helping the dacoits and imposed a posse of punitive police on the tāluk.

Meanwhile Sardar Vallabhbhai who had studied the situation came to know of the pact between the police and the Muslim outlaw. He exhorted the people not to pay the extra tax. He organized a band of 200 volunteers who were to keep watch in the villages day and night. He succeeded in persuading the people to shed their fear and keep their doors open. The people who lived in constant terror of the dacoits were locking themselves in, day and night. Even the police were seized with panic. Photographic evidence revealed that the constables posted in the tāluk used to lock their own doors in and out for fear of the dacoits even during the day! It was found that

bullets lodged in the bodies of certain victims were from police arms. This proved beyond doubt that the dacoits used police ammunition for their own purpose. These revelations made the Baroda police beat a hasty retreat. But the British police in spite of the resistance of the people went on exacting the punitive tax and proceeded with the attachment of properties of those who refused to pay.

When Sir Leslie Wilson, the new Governor of Bombay, heard about the Borsad scandal, he sent the Home Member to inquire into the affair on the spot. Then the truth came out, and he ordered the withdrawal of the police, suspending the punitive tax immediately.

In the meanwhile Devar Baba had already disappeared; evidently the vigil of the two hundred volunteers recruited by Sardar Patel was too irksome for him!

Guru Ka Bag Satyagraha

The Akali Sikhs, who are a reformist group in the community, have had to fight many a nonviolent battle with their own brethren to introduce social and religious reforms. One such struggle was launched in August 1922 on the issue of public control of the Gurudwaras or Sikh temples where the sacred book, the Granth Sahib, of the Sikhs is kept and worshipped. The Gurudwaras were usually in the hands of Mahants or priests who had become their virtual owners and corrupt practices had crept into many of these places. The Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee of the Akalis sought to get these temples transferred to the possession of public trustees. Law and custom were on the side of the Mahants, and Government backed them up. Other methods having proved ineffective, the Akalis sought to take possession of the temples by satyagraha and by bringing the pressure of public opinion to bear on the reactionary Mahants. Following is the story of one of the most heroic struggles launched by typical satyagrahi.

In this particular instance, the Mahant claimed exclusive ownership not only of the temple, but of the temple gardens as well. This claim was contested by some Akalis who were worshippers at the shrine and they cut down a tree in the garden of the temple as a test case. The Mahant took the matter to the Law Courts and was given police protection. Prohibitory orders were issued against all Akalis. Then began their daily martyrdom. A thousand of them planted themselves in a camp nearby while about four thousand lodged in the compound of the Golden Temple at Amritsar which is ten miles from

the spot. Batches of Akalis advanced to the temple gardens in defiance of police pickets and the prohibitory orders. They were brutally beaten—some of them till they dropped down unconscious. But the Akalis kept perfectly nonviolent and suffered uncomplainingly.

Every day a hundred from among those that were lodged in the Golden Temple and twenty-five from the adjacent camp marched in solemn and dignified formation with the determination either to reach the garden of the temple or to die in the attempt. Every one of them had a wreath of white flowers round his black turban. Every one took the oath of nonviolence. Then the whole party advanced up to the bridge near the garden. British and Indian constables stood guard at the bridge with iron-tipped rods. The batches arrived silently, stood a yard away from the police pickets and prayed silently. With one piercing cry of 'Sat-Sri-Akal', which means 'Truthful, Glorious, Timeless Being', they marched forward boldly. That was a sight for the gods. Then the cold black iron-tips of the police rods pierced the soft bodies of the devotees and warm red blood flowed out till they became unconscious. They were carried to their camps in that condition and the programme for the day ended on both sides.

Deenabandhu C.F. Andrews who witnessed this scene remarked that he felt the shadow of the Cross there when he saw the nonviolent army marching silently into the very jaws of suffering without a single cry and without even a defiant glance. The satyāgraha went on from day to day for a long time till more than a thousand were sent to the hospitals. Mr Macpherson, the Superintendent of Police who wrote a book on lathi-charge later, bears testimony in it as follows:

'It is quite possible that some injuries such as fractures may have occurred. The Jathas or batches did not resist the police at any time, being quite nonviolent. It is possible that some of the injured became unconscious. 953 cases of injuries had been tabulated, 269 above the trunk, 300 in front of the body, 79 brain, 60 genitals, 19 to perineum, 7 to teeth, and 158 contused wounds, 8 incised, 2 punctured, 40 urine trouble, 9 fractures and 2 dislocations.'

This evidence from the opposite party gives us an idea of the brutal treatment given to the nonviolent Akalis in the name of law and order and property rights, and under the guise of using minimum force.

Later the abominable policy of dispersal by physical forces was abandoned and arrests began to take place. About 210 arrests were

reported. In four sittings single Honorary Magistrate is said to have fined people to the extent of Rs 1,27,000. Still later the number of prisoners went up to about a thousand.

The satyāgraha ended in a compromise. In November 1922, Sir Gangaram took the lands in question on lease and he did not take any objection to the cutting of the trees. But the prisoners were kept on till March 1923 when on account of public pressures and in response to a resolution in the Panjab Council they were released in batches.

The Akalis had to wait for some years before the whole question of control of the Gurudwaras was settled satisfactorily by the passing of the Gurudwara Act.

The Flag Satyāgraha

The flag is but a rag if it is not the symbol of a nation's honour and if it has not been sanctioned at some time or other by the sacrifice of those who honour it. The tricolour has many times called upon India's sons to defend its honour and they have never failed.

The Nagpur Flag satyāgraha was an occasion when the honour of the flag had to be vindicated against the arbitrary and high-handed restrictions placed upon it by an alien government. Some fortuitous circumstances gave rise to this satyāgraha. A procession with the tricolour was in progress towards the Civil Lines in the city of Nagpur, the capital of the Central Provinces of those days. Now Nagpur is in Maharashtra State. The police objected to it and the District Magistrate promulgated a prohibitory order under Section 144 Criminal Procedure Code on 1 May 1923.

The volunteers in charge of the procession insisted on proceeding with the flag. They were arrested and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. This caught the imagination of the whole of India and volunteers flocked to Nagpur to vindicate the honour of the national flag. A committee called the Nagpur Satyāgraha Committee was formed and the struggle was carried on from day to day. Small batches were sent daily to court arrest. Seth Jamnalalji, a member of the Congress Working Committee, was in charge of the movement for some days. The Working Committee blessed it and congratulated the sufferers. The A.I.C.C. which met at Nagpur on the 8th, 9th, and 10th of July supported the struggle. After the arrest of Jamnalalji and Dr Hardikar, Sardar Vallabhbhai was in command. People throughout India were exhorted to observe the 18th of July as the Flag Day, All the Provincial Committees were expected to lead flag

processions in all the prominent cities and towns in their province, and send some volunteers to Nagpur. By that time more than a thousand volunteers had already gone to Nagpur and offered satyāgraha and were undergoing sentences in different prisons of the province.

The processions in Nagpur and other cities on the 18th of July were organized on a grand scale. Though the prohibitory order was still in force—in fact it had just been renewed—the police did not interfere and did not take action against the processionists on the 18th. They allowed them to pass without any permission being taken. The Government had seen the absurdity of imprisoning thousands for parading a flag on the highway.

The Delhi Special Session of the Congress which met in September 1923, congratulated the volunteers for having upheld the honour of the flag by their heroic suffering.

Satyāgraha Against Social Evils

Gandhi always insisted that satyāgraha is a weapon which can be used in all fields of life and against friend and foe, relative and stranger, one and many, individuals and institutions. If the Guru-ka-bag satyāgraha is an instance of the reformers of a community using satyāgraha against evil customs, there are other occasions where smaller groups have used it for still smaller causes.

In Dharmaj, a village in the Kheda district of Gujarat, even young boys resorted to satyāgraha as a protest against a social custom. A prominent citizen of the place proposed to give a costly caste-dinner on the 12th day after the death of his mother. The younger section of the community were against this old custom. When persuasion failed, they took a vow not to partake of the food served on the occasion, not to join elders in the ceremony, to observe a fast as a protest, and to bear cheerfully any harsh punishment that might be meted out to them.

So on that day about 285 students and even young children fasted. The elders were very angry but could do nothing against their own kith and kin who were ready to suffer cheerfully for their convictions. Gandhi wrote to the youngsters appreciating their willingness to suffer and encouraged them. He said that if they persevered and used the pure and beautiful weapon of love, all evil customs would vanish from society.



At Munshiganj in Bengal, satyāgraha by untouchables in front of a Kali temple had a strange ending. For nine months they had been offering satyāgraha for permission to enter the temple like all other Hindu worshippers. At last some of the worshippers went on fast. This was too much for the high-caste women of the place. Two hundred of them armed themselves with saws, axes, and hammers and stormed the temple, broke down the barriers that stood in the way and threw it open to their untouchable brothers! The men-folk quietly connived.



Two similar satyāgrahas, one at Parvati temple near Poona and another at the Nasik temple, were launched by untouchables for entry into the temples. They did not, however, prove successful, for various reasons. But that is no reason to despair about the use of this pure and potent weapon against social and other evils.

Satyāgraha In Jail

Satyāgraha can be practised even in jail to vindicate the just rights of the prisoners. An instance of such satyāgraha is the fast undertaken by about 1,600 prisoners in the Yeravda Central Prison, Poona. The reason behind this was the high-handed action of the superintendent of that prison who had uprooted certain Tulsi and flower plants and demolished small platforms put up for those plants and for installing small idols of Shiva, Ganapati or Maruti, all sacred to the Hindus. Many of the Hindu convicts used to water the plants and worship the idols every day and had made it a point not to eat till such worship was over. The prisoners were touched to the quick when they saw the strange acts of the superintendent. As a protest, they went on fast. However, they did not refuse to work.

This sudden turn of events took the European superintendent by surprise and he dared not proceed further. He had demolished only a few platforms and uprooted a few plants. His case was that there was mushroom growth of such platforms, plants and idols and that they went on multiplying. He feared that followers of other religions may also put up such things and that there would be no end to it. But when he saw the adamant stand of the prisoners he thought it was wise to withdraw and he explained to the leaders that he would restore the 'gods' and the platforms to them. On this assurance, the

prisoners broke their fast after twenty-four hours.

But the superintendent was not happy over the affair and he wanted to do away with those symbols by some means or other. Some weeks passed. Suddenly an order was given by the superintendent to the havildārs of the respective sections of the jail that all such plants, platforms, idols, etc. must be cleared off within twenty-four hours and the work of demolition began. Neither the passage of time nor their temporary triumph had lessened the strength of the sentiment of the prisoners. As soon as they heard about the fresh demolitions, hundreds of prisoners solemnly resolved again not to touch food till their 'gods' were returned. They continued their tasks but refused either to talk with the jail authorities or to touch food.

Forty-eight hours passed and the atmosphere was grim. In one section called the 'Separate' when the havildār came with a pick-axe and asked the Hindu Mahars to demolish the platforms, a prominent Hindu prisoner told the Mahars that it was none of their duty to lay hands on things sacred to brother-Hindus. This touched them and they refused to demolish the platforms. The havildār then thought of doing the work himself. But the prisoner appealed to him also. 'The pay you are receiving is not for such work as goes against the very grain of your religious sentiment. Supposing tomorrow the superintendent asks you to murder your children, are you going to do it for the sake of the paltry sum of twenty-six rupees per month that you are getting? If I were you, I would rather starve and beg and do whatever I like rather than injure the religious sentiments of the hundreds that are fasting today and are willing to lay down their lives.' The havildār began to hesitate. But still he was not willing to lay aside the pick-axe. But the prisoner would not leave him. He said: 'If what I have said does not appeal to you, well, here I am between you and the platform. Let the first stroke fall on my neck and when you have cleared off my corpse, you can well proceed with your task.' This moved the havildār. All the while, more than a dozen prisoners were looking on. The havildār put off the work and went away.

The third day dawned. Several prisoners had to be taken to the hospital as they fell unconscious on account of exhaustion while doing their tasks. None talked, none demurred, none complained. At regular intervals food was offered to them and they refused. The number was between eleven to twelve hundred. They refused to talk except through their barrack leaders.

At last realizing the seriousness of the situation the superintendent

ordered new platforms to be built, one near each bathing ghat and the prisoners were allowed to plant Tulsi plants on those platforms and the idols were restored. A written order was circulated by the Superintendent that the new arrangement would continue. One of the senior jail officials admitted that the satyāgraha of the prisoners was one of the cleanest examples he had heard of.

CHAPTER 24

HISTORY AS WITNESS

Richard Gregg has remarked: 'As the taste of historians inclines more towards politics and wars these other events [nonviolent resistance campaigns] have received but slight attention at their hands and the records of many of them have been lost.' Gandhi also is of the same opinion. When asked for historical instances of the working of soul-force he remarked: 'We have evidence if it [history] means the doings of Kings and Emperors, there can be no evidence of soul-force or passive resistance in such history. . . . History is really a record of every interruption of the even working of the force of love or of the soul.'

Even so, one may see things from the angle of nonviolence and try to find out instances of such struggles which help us to study the working of this type of resistance. Whether a particular nonviolent resistance was successful or not is not of cardinal importance. Violent resistance too fails, and fails miserably, leaving a fatal trail of blood and ruin in its wake on both sides. What we have to study here is the manner and method in which nonviolent resistance was organized in certain circumstances and how it worked. No doubt, till the advent of Gandhi the science and art of nonviolent resistance did not take definite shape. In the past it was offered in a haphazard manner without a philosophical basis and there was no conscious or detailed technique in its working. But still some of the characteristics which later distinguished mass satyāgraha campaigns were there and they arose out of the situation itself.

Aldous Huxley who stands for the method of nonviolent revolution mentions the following nonviolent movements which were partially or completely successful.

Finland

From 1901-1905 the Finns carried on a nonviolent resistance to Russian Officers. That was completely successful and in 1905 the law imposing conscription on Finland was repealed.

Germany

In Germany two campaigns of nonviolent resistance were success-

fully carried out against Bismarck—the Kultur Kampf by the Catholics and the campaign launched by the working class after 1871 for the recognition of the Social Democratic Party.

British Labour

Huxley gives an instance of how a threat of nonviolent non-cooperation by British Labour averted war between England and Russia. It happened in 1920. The Council of Action formed on 9 August 1920 warned the Government that if it persisted in its plan for sending British troops to Poland to attack the Russians, a general strike would be called, labour would refuse to transport munitions or men, and a complete boycott of the war would be declared. Faced by this ultimatum the Lloyd George Government abandoned its plans for waging war with Russia.

Hungary

There is an instance of mass nonviolent resistance which the whole nation of Hungary launched in the middle of the nineteenth century in Europe. The struggle can be divided into two parts—one occupies the period of 1833 to 1848, and the other from 1848 to 1867.

It was in or about 1720 that Austria and Hungary by their joint efforts freed their own territories from invaders. They agreed to unite under one monarchy as 'free and equal' nations. The court remained at Vienna and the Hungarian nobility was gradually denationalized. But a few ardent and sincere souls kept up the idea of 'Hungary a nation'. When in 1828 the Austrian Emperor levied troops in Hungary, the Hungarians refused to enlist declaring that the Hungarian Diet or Parliament alone had the right to levy troops.

The struggle went on under the leadership of Francis Deak, a man of ideals and action, till a sovereign Hungarian Government responsible to the Hungarian people was established in 1848. Deak was made the Minister of Justice. But the triumph was short-lived. Austria was planning the subjugation of Hungary all along and Austrian troops occupied Hungary on a slight pretext. The constitution was scrapped, the Diet was suppressed, national institutions were destroyed, the Hungarian language was banned, the County Councils were dissolved and the country parcelled out into military districts under Austrian Officers. For a time all seemed to be lost.

Hungary is dead, said the statesmen of Europe, but Francis Deak still lived and in him lived Hungary.

Then began the second phase of Hungary's struggle. Unable to act politically, Deak went ahead with nationalist schemes of education and industry. By 1857, the progress of Hungary had become a cause of serious apprehension in the Court of Vienna.

Various methods of conciliation were tried by the Austrian Emperor. Bribery, office and threats were some of the methods resorted to. But Deak was adamant. He exhorted the people not to co-operate in any scheme initiated by Austria till the Hungarian Diet was recognized as an independent Government. The royal visit was boycotted. Austrian goods were no longer in demand. Deak preached: 'Do not be betrayed into acts of violence nor abandon the ground of legality. This is the safe ground on which, unarmed ourselves, we can hold our own against armed force. If suffering be necessary, suffer with dignity.' He gave the slogan: 'Resistance by every means except that of violence'.

Hungarians simply declined to pay the Austrian tax-collector. Goods were seized by Austrian Officers, but no Hungarian was willing either to buy or sell. The Government found that the cost of confiscating and selling the property was more than what they could hope to collect by way of tax. Then for some time Austrian solidiers were billeted upon Hungarian homesteads. The people did not resist physically but adopted an attitude of non-cooperation. Silent refusal to assist in any way made the position of the solidiers impossible. The Austrian Government declared the boycott of Austrian goods illegal. But the Hungarians went on; jails were filled to overflowing. Hungary refused to send any representatives to the Austrian Parliament. The County Councils too declined to work under Austrian supervision. Then Francis Joseph tried to conciliate. Prisoners were released and partial self-government was restored. But the Hungarians insisted upon full rights. In anger the Emperor decreed conscription. But the Hungarians refused to recognize the decree. Finally Austria had to yield. On 18 February 1867, Hungary got back its full and free constitution.

British General Strike

Though not successful, mainly because of bad leadership, the great general strike in Great Britain in support of the demand of the coal-miners in early May 1926 may be cited as a good example of non-violent mass resistance. In spite of grave provocation by government, the rank and file of labour that struck work were, almost without

exception and throughout the nine days of strike, nonviolent and orderly in speech and action and were surprisingly good-humoured, loyal, solid and staunch. About three million workers were involved.

The strike had been authorized as early as July 1925 by the British Trade Union Congress. The General Council of the Labour Congress was in charge of it. But they had not made adequate preparations to deal with the situation and they had been trying to avoid the strike. It was this tendency on the part of the leaders that was ultimately responsible for the failure.

The Government, on the other hand, was well-prepared and from the beginning they spread the idea that the strike was not based on economic grievances but was a revolutionary attempt to destroy the Government and the Constitution of Britain. The Government rallied a sufficient number of people from the middle classes to run railways and other transport services. There was, of course, no truth in the allegation that it was a revolutionary strike.

Sir John Simon on the third day of the strike declared in the House of Commons that the General Strike was illegal and that the funds of the Unions which took part in it were liable to be seized, that every striker had broken a contract of service and therefore was liable for damages. Five days later the judgement of Mr. Justice Ashbury substantiated Sir John Simon's opinion.

The General Council became nervous and the following day without consulting either the rank and file or the miners in whose support the strike was called, the Council called on the Prime Minister, surrendered unconditionally and called off the strike. The workers were dismayed and resented this sudden betrayal. Victimization on a large scale followed and the Unions also lost prestige, some legal powers, and above all self-confidence.

Pecs Miners

The strike at Pecs in Hungary and its ultimate success show what a few determined men can do by taking the right attitude and sticking to it to the last.

The strike was the outcome of an economic grievance. In October 1934, 1,200 miners at Pecs struck work asking for more work and the equivalent of about fourteen shillings pay a week. Owing to the depression, they had work only for three days in a week, and that too on inadequate pay and with an eight per cent cut in wages.

The strike was declared when the miners were in the pits. They

refused to come out unless their demands were satisfied. Two days later forty-four of them were brought up in a precarious condition. They were suffering from hunger, thirst and exhaustion. Some were unconscious. Many were raving madly and some were at the point of death. The Hungarian Government declared a state of alarm in the area round about Pecs and the military was posted near the place. Negotiations with the miners did not make any headway.

The miners sent up a message saying, 'It is useless to negotiate further unless you give your word now that all our demands would be granted. Rather than suffer the pangs of death by starvation we will commit suicide by smothering ourselves. . . . We are Hungarians. As such we hope that our countrymen may hear our cry of pity from the depths of the mines and from the depths of our hearts. . . . We were soldiers in war and we were protected then. We are now soldiers of production and claim protection likewise.' Later they sent up a request for 345 coffins and the message, 'We are determined to die. Forget all about us. Goodbye to the children.'

On the third day, the employers locked out 3,000 other miners. This aggravated the bitterness among the 40,000 inhabitants of the area. Military patrolled the streets. Two eye-witnesses, both of them sympathetic, went down to start negotiations. Charles Peyer, a Social Democrat Deputy said: 'I have seen many bitter strikes but I have never witnessed anything approaching the savage determination called forth in the Pecs strike.' General Janos Estergalyes, a Democratic-Socialist member of the Hungarian Parliament, saw men in the pits tied to posts by their friends to prevent them from committing suicide. He saw hunger, exhaustion, mass insanity. He said the sight was 'the most terrible remembrance of my life.' Utterly exhausted they were huddled down there in the heat, lying on the dirty watersoaked bed of the mines with huge chunks of coal for pillows.

After four days the people were persuaded to accept a compromise. The State Railways agreed to buy more coal from that company. An investigation into reduction of wages was promised by the Government. The company assured that there would not be any victimization; some bonus was also granted.

But when the strikers recovered from the ordeal they had undergone, they were completely dissatisfied and said that they accepted the terms only because they were out of their minds and did not know what they were doing.

Three and a half months later, 698 Pecs miners went on strike demanding a ten per cent increase. There was the usual lock-out and the parade of police force. But within 29 hours, the management granted the demand and promised not to victimise.

About this strike Mr. Gregg, in his book, *Power of Nonviolence*, remarks: 'While some of the acts and the inner attitude of some of the miners were violent, their utter desperation, their voluntary suffering, unity, endurance, the clearness and the simplicity of the issue were so dramatic as to break through the ignorance and the indifference of the world. The owners were compelled to yield, after the second strike, to the entire demand.'

The Dukhobars

The Dukhobars (*i.e.* the spirit-wrestlers) were an agricultural Christian community living in the Caucasus. They had a leader, Peter Verigin, whom they looked upon as an incarnation of the Deity. At his bidding they refused to serve in the armies. Cossack troops fell upon them and flogged them. Their first martyr was brutally done to death by a penal battalion in August 1896. Hundreds more died from exposure and lack of food and from banishment to unhealthy places where they could find no work.

It was an industrious peasantry which was thus harassed and persecuted for refusing to do military service. Even those who sympathised with them were persecuted. Three authors, Birukov, Tregubov and Chertkov who wrote an article pleading their cause became victims of official wrath. The first two were banished, the third was allowed to go to foreign lands.

By 1898 the Dukhobars were allowed to emigrate and on 1 October 1898 the first two families were taken to Canada. There, their objection to military service was respected and they were looked upon as peaceful citizens. Facilities were given to 7,363 Dukhobars to emigrate from Russia to Canada.

Nonviolent Resistance In Kanara

The districts of North Kanara and South Kanara in the southern part of India, were one district in 1862 and were called Kanara. It was included in the Madras Presidency. It was partitioned in 1862 and North Kanara was attached to the Bombay Presidency and South Kanara to the Madras Presidency. Before the British conquest the district of Kannada (Kanara) formed part of the Kingdom of Mysore.

In 1799 the British succeeded in defeating Tippu Sultan in the Mysore war and annexed the whole kingdom. Sir Thomas Munro occupied Kanara in 1799.

The people of Kanara did not bend easily to their new rulers. On his entry into the district Sir Thomas met with stiff resistance but of a nonviolent type. The letters of Sir Thomas Munro give us a good idea of their struggle.

Complete non-cooperation, social and political boycott, evacuation when necessary were the methods they used. Sir Thomas wanted the people to recognize the new regime and offered them a new settlement of land as a bait; but the landholders refused to submit the old land accounts. They are said to have even destroyed most of them. Then Sir Thomas began partitioning the land quite arbitrarily and by sheer coercion. He played upon the conflicting interests of the tenants and landlords and divided them. Thus after some years of intrigue and coercion he was able to establish his hold.

Extracts given below from Sir Thomas Munro's letters speak for themselves:

'The ryots themselves are a most unruly and turbulent race. . . . As soon as they discovered my intention, they entered into combinations to bring me to terms. . . . They refused to come to the cutcherry. . . . They almost starved some of the amildārs I had despatched, by preventing them from getting fire and water; and whenever I approached a village, the inhabitants went to another, so that I was sometimes several weeks in a district without seeing one of them. . . . If, instead of rising in a mass like Frenchmen, and sending in memorials about privileges, they had spent the time in the cutcherry, in discussing the state of cultivation in their different villages, the settlement would have been much more accurate than it is—easier for them to pay and for me to realise. . . . The owners are a bold, sturdy set of fellows, and would spurn at your plan of being made dependent on any mesne lord.' (From a letter written on 20 December 1799, from Haldipur North Kanara.)

'I would rather live upon an ensign's pay in a sunny climate than be the sovereign of Kanara.' (From another letter written on 25 August 1800, from Kundapur, South Kanara.)

CHAPTER 25

ROWLATT ACT SATYĀGRAHA

After the smaller experiments of Champaran and Kheda in 1917 and 1918, a very great opportunity offered itself to Gandhi to organize satyāgraha on a nation-wide scale. That was when the Rowlatt Bills were passed (3 March 1919) into an Act.

World War I had ended victoriously for the Allies in November 1918. India had played her part and poured her blood and treasure unstintingly. She expected at least a big instalment of swaraj, if not full swaraj. But even before some paltry political rights were thrown like crumbs at hungry India, there came the Rowlatt Bills which sought to curtail and crush the civil rights of Indians. The Government planned to suppress every vestige of sedition and were arming themselves with summary powers analogous to those during war under the Defence of India rules.

The Rowlatt report on sedition and revolutionary crime in India was published on 19 January 1919 and the bills were introduced in the Supreme Legislative Council on 6 February 1919. Gandhi had announced on 24 February 1919 that he would lead a movement of satyāgraha if the bills were passed into law. Bill No. 2 had been dropped, but Bill No. 1, called the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, was passed on 3 March 1919. While the bills were pending, Gandhi toured the country and issued statements. There was very good response, especially in the South. A Satyāgraha Committee was set up and Gandhi drew up a pledge on the 18th of March 1919.

The Bills were characterized in the pledge as unjust, subversive of the principles of liberty and justice, destructive of the elementary rights of an individual on which the safety of India as a whole and of the State itself was based.

Instructions were issued by him from Madras fixing the 30th of March for launching the satyāgraha movement. Later the date was changed to the 6th of April. But the fresh instructions did not reach Delhi and some other places in time. So those places observed the 30th as Satyāgraha Day.

In his manifesto issued on 28 February 1919 Gandhi said: 'The step taken is probably the most momentous in the history of India.

... The India Covenanters (pledged satyāgrahīs) by their determination to undergo every form of suffering make an irresistible appeal to the Government towards which they bear no ill-will, and provide the believers in the efficacy of violence as a means of securing redress of grievances, with an infallible remedy, and withal a remedy that blesses those that use it and also those against whom it is used. ... The Covenanters have convinced themselves that disease is serious enough and that milder measures have utterly failed.'

On 23 March, Gandhi issued from Madras the programme that was to be observed throughout India on the Satyāgraha Day.. He said therein: 'Satyāgraha is essentially a religious movement. It is a process of purification and penance. It seeks to secure reforms or redress of grievances by self-suffering. The 6th of April (by which time the Viceroy would have given his assent to the Act) should be observed as a day of humiliation and prayer.' The details of the programme were as follows :

1. A twentyfour hours' fast should be observed but not as a hunger strike to put any pressure on Government. It is the necessary discipline to fit satyāgrahīs for Civil Disobedience. For others, it is a token of the intensity of their wounded feelings.
2. All work should be suspended on the day.
3. Public meetings should be held and resolutions should be passed for the withdrawal of the Rowlatt Act.

This was the programme for the general public. There was a special programme for the pledged satyāgrahīs (of whom in Bombay alone there were 600). They were asked by the Satyāgraha Committee to disobey civilly the law that applied to prohibited literature and registration of newspapers. Detailed instructions were given to them. Prohibited literature was to be sold not in secret but openly. It was to be done in a normal way. The seller should be easily traceable. If there were not enough copies to sell, it was proposed to read portions of a prohibited book to the public. If all other things failed, copies were to be made by hand. Gandhi himself issued an unregistered newspaper called *Satyāgraha* and published it on the 7th of April 1919. It was just a half-sheet and among other things contained instructions to satyāgrahīs on how they should face imprisonment, fine, attachment of property, etc. without evasion and without defence.

The response was very good throughout India. In most places there were peaceful hartāls, accompanied by fasting and prayer. Huge

meetings were also held in many places. Millions took part in the programme. Unfortunately, in some places the crowds were over-enthusiastic and the situation was not handled sympathetically and tactfully by the police. Delhi, as indicated above, observed the day earlier. There was shooting by the police, and five died as a result and several were wounded. In other places too the Government showed its iron claws. Dr Kichlew and Dr Satyapal were spirited away from Amritsar where they were busy preparing for the next session of the Congress. The people of Gujranwala and Kasur also resorted to violence on grave provocation. The situation in Panjab thus seemed to be serious. Gandhi was frantically invited there and in response to that he started. But the Panjab Government did not allow him to proceed and he was escorted back from Kosi to Bombay. This angered the people at Ahmedabad and Viramgaon and there were excesses by the mob and violence to life and property.

Then came the climax, the Jallianwalla Bagh tragedy. General Dyer shot down, according to Government reports, four hundred helpless, unarmed people and wounded about a thousand. Martial law, many atrocities and a series of humiliating acts perpetrated by the military and civil authorities followed. Public floggings, crawling orders, summary trials went on. A reign of terror darkened Panjab for months together. Those acts will ever remain as the darkest spots on the British administration in India. To add to this, there were fifty-one death sentences passed in Panjab alone, a couple of hundred were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment and several people were deported. Some of these events had their own effect on Gandhi's mind. On the 18th day of April 1919, he suspended the movement, so that the name of satyāgraha may not be tarnished. He realized that mob-violence had broken out for some reason or other. He also wished to stop the severe repression to which the Government resorted on the excuse that mob-violence had broken out. The statement he issued on this occasion says: 'I have greater faith in satyāgraha today than before. It is my perception of the law of satyāgraha which impels me to suggest the suspension. . . . I understood the forces of evil. . . . Satyāgraha had nothing to do with the violence of the mob at Ahmedabad and Viramgaon. Satyāgraha was neither the cause nor the occasion of the upheaval. If anything, the presence of satyāgraha has acted as a check. . . . The events in the Panjab are unconnected with the satyāgraha movement. . . . Our satyāgraha must, therefore, now consist in ceaselessly helping the

authorities in all the ways available to us as satyāgrahīs to restore order and curb lawlessness. . . . We must fearlessly spread the doctrine of satya and ahimsā and then and not till then shall we be able to undertake mass satyāgraha. . . .’

Subsequently on July 1919 Gandhi issued another statement in which he said that, on account of indications of goodwill on the part of the Government and advice from many of his friends, he would not resume civil resistance as it was not his purpose to embarrass the Government. He called upon satyāgrahīs to carry on propaganda for the use of pure Svadeshi materials and for Hindu-Muslim Unity.

However, the fate of the Rowlatt Act, for the withdrawal of which the movement had been launched, had been already sealed. One of the bills never became law, and that which became law never came into force. It was already a dead letter.

This was the first satyāgraha on a nation-wide scale. The whole of India was the field of operations. Satyāgraha could not, however, be continued for long. It held sway only for a brief period, from the 6th of April to the 18th, and then it had to be suspended. The parties concerned were the people of India on one side and the Government of India on the other. The issue was the provocative and most unjustifiable imposition of restrictions on the liberty of citizens. The main form of the satyāgraha adopted was the civil disobedience of certain unwanted laws selected by the Satyāgraha Committee. For the masses, peaceful hartāl, fasting and prayer, and public meetings had been recommended. Unfortunately, mob-violence broke out and the Government repressed it with a heavy and brutal hand. The inhuman limits to which an enraged government could go were exposed. Gandhi very promptly suspended the movement, thus giving no further scope either to mob-violence or to the brutality of the Government. But it was a misfortune that the latter pursued their vindictive policy. The object, however, of rendering the Rowlatt Act a nullity was achieved.

CHAPTER 26

NONVIOLENT NON-COOPERATION

If civil disobedience of certain laws by a few pledged satyāgrahīs, for the removal of a specific grievance, namely the Rowlatt Act, was the feature of the first of the national satyāgraha campaigns, nonviolent non-cooperation with the Government for righting the Panjab and Khilāfat wrongs, and incidentally for the establishment of svarāj, was the predominant note of the second national struggle.

On 21 July 1919 Gandhi announced that he would not revive satyāgraha immediately. But that did not mean that all was well. He admitted that he had committed a 'Himalayan blunder' when he miscalculated the forces of violence. But the causes of extreme disaffection were still there and the Government by fresh assaults on the liberty of the people was rousing their anger.

The next satyāgraha movement was gathering strength on account of the repressive methods of the Government, and the niggardly attitude they adopted towards the question of Indian political reforms.

The perpetrators of the Jallianwalla Bagh tragedy and of the Panjab atrocities were indemnified and officers concerned were let off with a certificate of 'honesty' though their judgement was considered to be wrong. General Dyer was idolized and a sword with £20,000 was presented to him by the European community. The Government appointed the Hunter Committee to enquire into the Panjab wrongs. But it was only a white-washing Committee. The Congress could not cooperate with it as important political prisoners were not given facilities to give evidence. Even so, the Indian members wrote notes of dissent. But the Government disregarded the dissenters and adopted the majority report at the end of May 1920. Meanwhile, the Congress had appointed a non-official committee which published its report on 25 March 1920. It was subsequently proscribed. So the Panjab wrongs remained an open sore and feelings were inflamed where responsible Englishmen praised the indiscriminate and merciless murderers of innocent, unarmed men, women and children.

To these was added the Khilafat wrong which roused the Muslims of India. During the war, the British Prime Minister had promised to offer favourable peace terms to Turkey which would keep the

Khilafat (the religious centre) inviolate and which would not allow Muslim territories in Arabia and the Middle East to pass under a non-Muslim authority. But in the peace terms with Turkey published on 14 May 1920 all promises were thrown to the winds and the Viceroy came out with a statement exhorting Muslims to accept things with resignation. But Muslim opposition was growing steadily and when the leaders saw that it was useless to approach the British Government with petitions and prayers, they decided to follow the lead of Gandhi and take to non-cooperation, the only alternative to armed revolt.

Thus the Panjab and the Khilāfat wrongs and the extreme unwillingness of the British to part with power were egging people on to further action.

Meanwhile, Gandhi was gaining the confidence of the people. When the ban on his entry was lifted, he went to Panjab on the 17th of October 1919. The Amritsar Congress met soon after. He condemned the violence of the people as well as that of the Government. He told the people plainly: 'I say, do not return madness with madness, but return madness with sanity and the whole situation will be yours!'

But by March 1920, Gandhi had become very much disappointed with the attitude of the Government regarding the Khilāfat. In his manifesto issued on 10 March, there were already clear indications that non-cooperation was imminent. 'Now a word as to what may be done if the demands are not granted. The barbarous method is warfare open or secret. This must be ruled out if only because it is impracticable. . . . Non-cooperation, therefore, is the only remedy left open to us. It is the cleanest remedy as it is the most effective, when it is absolutely free from violence. Voluntary withdrawal (of all help to Government) alone is the test of popular feeling and dissatisfaction'

Then the National Week was observed throughout India from April 6 to 13. It began with fasting and prayer and three meetings were held during the week, one for demanding the repeal of the Rowlatt Act, the other asking for amends for the Panjab wrongs, and the third for urging the Government to stick to its promise regarding the Khilāfat. No hartāl was advised. The people were exhorted to meditate on the virtues of satya and ahimsā and prepare themselves for future action.

In the meanwhile, Gandhi had become the president of the All-

India Home Rule League. Its name was changed to 'Svarāj Sabhā'. A fourfold plan of constructive work was to be carried out through the Sabhā. Hindu-Muslim unity, spread of *svadeshi* including the use of 'charkhā', spread of Hindustani as the lingua franca of India, and the formation of linguistic provinces were the items he proposed to the Sabhā.

He declared at this stage: 'I believe that it is possible to introduce uncompromising truth and honesty in the political life of the country.' He said that he would strain every nerve for the acceptance of truth and nonviolence as the basis for all national activities.

The Muslim deputation that had been to Mr Lloyd George, the then Prime Minister, returned disillusioned. They began to emphasize drastic action, which meant nonviolent non-cooperation as enunciated by Gandhi. The disappointing Turkish peace terms were published on 14 May 1920. The Khilāfat Committee met on 28 May 1920 and adopted Gandhian non-cooperation.

The Hunter Committee Report, an eyewash on the Panjab wrongs, was published on 28 May. On the 30th of the same month, the A.I.C.C. met at Banaras and decided to convene a special session of the Congress in Calcutta in September.

Gandhi announced the inauguration of the nonviolent non-cooperation movement on the 1st of August 1920, as contemplated by the Khilāfat Committee in June. While writing about the beginning of the second nation-wide *satyāgraha*, he wrote in the *Young India* of 28 July 1920. 'The first of August will be as important an event in the history of India as was the 6th of April last year'. The 6th of April marked the beginning of the end of the Rowlatt Act The power that wrests justice from an unwilling Government . . . is the power of *satyāgraha*, whether it is known by the name of civil disobedience or non-cooperation. . . . As in the past, the commencement is to be marked by fasting and prayer . . . suspension of business and by meetings to pass resolutions praying for the revision of peace terms and justice for the Panjab, and for inculcating non-cooperation until justice has been done. The giving up of titles is to begin from that day But the greatest thing is to organize and evolve order and discipline.' He again stressed the necessity of absolute nonviolence.

Then the Special Session of the Congress on the 4th of September 1920, passed the non-cooperation resolution by 1886 to 884 votes. The objects were declared—to get redress for the injustice done to Panjab and the Khilāfat and the establishment of *svarāj*. The Nagpur

Congress which met in December 1920 was one of the biggest sessions, and it was attended by 14,582 delegates including 1,050 Muslims and 169 ladies. The Congress passed the resolution on non-cooperation amidst scenes of great enthusiasm. Those who were against the resolution in Calcutta had been completely converted. C.R. Das proposed it and Lala Lajpatrai seconded it at Nagpur.

The movement was called progressive nonviolent non-cooperation. In the first place, there was the fivefold boycott of titles and honours, of elections and legislatures, of schools and colleges, of courts and tribunals and of foreign cloth. There was also a constructive side to it. National schools and institutions were to be started, arbitration courts and Panchayats were to be established, spinning on charkhas was to begin. Then Government levees, durbars and all semi-official or official functions were to be boycotted, sale and use of drinks and drugs were to be prevented through peaceful picketing. People were asked not to offer themselves as recruits for civil or military service.

Never before was the country so awakened, so active, so united and so determined as during the eventful months of 1921-1922. Hindus and Muslims seemed to have been welded into a single community. The movement which began with a simple hartāl, fasting, and prayer spread like wild fire. The masses took up the campaign of prohibition spontaneously. There was some sporadic mob violence, but on the whole, the campaign was nonviolent, vigorous and effective. National schools sprang up by the hundreds. The Bezwada drive pushed up the Congress membership to fifty lakhs. The Tilak Svarāj Fund was over-subscribed and went up to 115 lakhs. About 20 lakhs of charkhas began to ply in India.

Arrests were being effected on a fairly large scale. Prominent workers were not spared. Yet, in November 1921, the Government made it plain that they had instructed local Governments to take action only against those persons who had gone beyond the limits originally set by the organizers of the movement and had by speech or writing openly incited the public to violence or had attempted to tamper with the loyalty of the army or the police.

But this instruction was not always obeyed by the local Governments. Shootings took place at Dharwar and at Malegaon. Nor were the mass arrests and false prosecutions at Dharwar of all Congress workers in any way in consonance with the above policy. In most of the provinces, important Congress leaders had been either convicted or bound over. The success of the Bezwada programme,

the successful boycott of the Prince of Wales' visit and similar activities had made the Government lose its balance. Most of the workers had offered no defence and were behind bars by the end of the year. By December 1921, the Government had set in motion the Criminal Law Amendment Act under which they could arrest Congress workers. They declared the Volunteer Organization in the U.P. and Bengal unlawful. That became a fruitful source of civil disobedience which really had not yet formed part of the general Congress programme. But Government itself showed the way by its repressive action. By the end of December, therefore, the number of prisoners had swollen to 30,000. The lathi, however, was not much in evidence in those days.

We now come up to the Ahmedabad Congress which was held in an atmosphere of great tension when people demanded drastic action. It went further than the Nagpur Congress and called upon people to offer individual as well as mass civil disobedience wherever the atmosphere was conducive to such action. As a reply to the mass prosecution of volunteers by Government, the Congress decided upon enrolling fifty thousand volunteers pledged to nonviolence.

In pursuance of the resolution of the Congress to take up mass civil disobedience, Gandhi began preparations to launch an intense no-tax campaign in the Bardoli taluk of Surat District. The Taluk Conference passed a resolution on 31 January 1922 saying that it was prepared for the campaign and that it should be sanctioned by the A.I.C.C. Gandhi wrote on 1 February 1922 a long and comprehensive letter to the Viceroy informing him of his intention to start a no-tax campaign in Bardoli, since all other forms of getting redress had failed. Government promptly replied justifying its repressive policy and warning Gandhi not to begin the proposed campaign.

An unfortunate incident upset the Congress programme. On 5 February in far off Chauri Chaura in the district of Gorakhpur in the U.P. some Congress volunteers, in a fit of anger, were responsible for the murder of some 20 constables and a sub-inspector. There were some small riots in Madras on 13 January 1922, when the Prince of Wales visited the southern capital. Gandhi felt that it would be wrong to proceed with Civil Disobedience in the face of such violence. So he induced the Working Committee, in spite of opposition, to suspend mass civil disobedience. It drew up instead a comprehensive Constructive Programme. The A.I.C.C. met at Delhi on the 24th of the same month and practically endorsed the stand taken by the Working

Committee except that it allowed individual civil disobedience whenever necessary.

Gandhi was arrested on the 10th of March and was sentenced to six years' imprisonment on the 18th. The Civil Disobedience Committee submitted its report in November 1922 that civil disobedience was not a practicable proposition then in the country. A plan for entering Legislative Councils was mooted, but it did not receive official support from the Congress for another year. Civil disobedience was no longer there and nonviolent non-cooperation had also lost its edge.

The immediate objectives were not gained as the movement had to be withdrawn on account of unexpected violence. But the indirect gains were invaluable. Gandhi, when questioned about the utility of the movement by some political prisoners in Yeravda in September 1922, emphatically declared that the country had advanced by at least thirty years, if not more. The Governor of Bombay is said to have remarked that the movement was within an inch of success!

CHAPTER 27

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE FOR SVARĀJ

The Civil Disobedience launched by Gandhi in 1930 was a direct attempt to secure svarāj. The background of the struggle can be stated in brief. Since Gandhi's incarceration in March 1922, the Civil Disobedience Committee of the Congress toured the country and made certain recommendations. All of them were practically accepted by the A.I.C.C. in the last week of November 1922. Civil disobedience as a mass movement was suspended. The question of Council-entry also came to the fore and though consideration of that programme was postponed, the school of thought which proposed the plan was gradually gaining ground. By the time Gandhi came out of prison before time on 5 February 1923 (on account of an operation for appendicitis) the Svarājist Party had not only been formed but was functioning with the consent of the Congress. Gandhi saw no wisdom in trying to suppress it. Instead, he allowed it to go its way and restricted himself mainly to constructive activities on as big a scale as possible. So the years 1924-1929 may be said to be years when the two-fold programme of constructive work and Council work held sway and occupied the energies and minds of Congressmen in India.

The more impatient spirits were, however, not idle. By 1927 the idea of complete independence for India had caught the imagination, especially of the youth in India. They were disgusted with the talk of Dominion Status and with the much-boasted advantage of the British connexion. Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, S. Srinivasa Iyengar, Bulusu Sambamurti and some others were the protagonists of the new idea. At the Madras session of the Congress in December 1927, a resolution was passed which said: 'This Congress declares the goal of the Indian people to be complete independence'. The idea was later incorporated into the creed of the Congress in the Lahore session in 1929. Another important event, or rather a glaring blunder committed by the British Government, unified India at this juncture as nothing else had done since 1921. This was the appointment of an all-white Commission called the Simon Commission to inquire into the problem of political reforms in India. It arrived in

Bombay on 3 February 1928, and was greeted with an all-India hartāl and meetings of protest. All the parties in India were almost unanimous not only in condemning it but in non-cooperating with it. It went back on 14 April 1929, after finishing its lonely labours. During its stay, it visited many cities. There were huge demonstrations almost everywhere against the Commission. The police at some places like Madras, Lahore and Calcutta treated the demonstrators with lathi charges and sometimes even firing was resorted to. Among the injured were leaders like Lala Lajpatrai and Jawaharlal Nehru.

The appointment of this Commission showed how oblivious the British Government was to public opinion. The Congress decided that it was time to act. In the meantime, the Congress had appointed a Committee with Motilal Nehru as Chairman and with eminent liberals like Tej Bahadur Sapru and M.R. Jayakar as members to draw up 'a Dominion Status Constitution' for India. It was ready and was passed by the All Parties Conference held at Lucknow at the end of 1928. That year's session of the Congress was held at Calcutta. It undertook to adopt the Constitution recommended by the All Parties Conference provided that it was accepted by the British Parliament in its entirety before 31 December 1929. But in case it was rejected, the Congress would be free to organize a campaign of nonviolent non-cooperation, to advise the country even to refuse taxes, and to carry on civil disobedience in such other manner as may be decided upon. This was the germ of the movement to be started in 1930.

The Government did not pay heed to this resolution. It was during that year that the Simon Report was published and the British Government was going its own way. On 23 December 1929, that is, a week before the Lahore session of the Congress, the Viceroy invited Gandhi and Motilal Nehru to see him. During the talks, Gandhi wanted to fix the issue of the Dominion Status. He asked the Viceroy bluntly whether the proposed Round Table Conference would be meeting on the express understanding that India should get Dominion Status immediately. The Viceroy was not in a position to assure him. He could not go beyond the vague announcements already made. The British statesmen were evidently tinkering with the problem. The main resolution at Lahore, therefore, veered towards complete independence. The creed was changed from Svarāj to Pūrṇa Svarāj or complete independence. This momentous decision was taken on the last day of the year 1929. As a preliminary to organizing a campaign

for independence, Congress members of the legislatures were instructed to resign and people were asked to take no part in the elections. The resolution, *inter alia*, stated: 'This Congress appeals to the nation zealously to prosecute the constructive programme of the Congress and authorizes the A.I.C.C., whenever it deems fit, to launch upon a programme of civil disobedience, including non-payment of taxes. . . .'

Such was the formal beginning of the Civil Disobedience movement of 1930.

The new Working Committee met on 2 January 1930. Twenty-one members of the Central Assembly, and nine of the Council of State resigned. A hundred and seventy-two Provincial Councillors also resigned. This was quite a good response. The Working Committee then decided to observe 26 January 1930 as the Independence Day throughout the country. A pledge to be taken by each Congressman was drafted and sent out.

The Viceroy replied with a speech in the Central Assembly on 25 January 1930 in which he covered many issues and stated that there was no intention to give immediate Dominion Status to India though that was the declared goal. This justified the stand taken by the Congress. Gandhi put forth his famous eleven points which, he said, were the substance of independence. He declared there would be no talk of civil disobedience if the eleven points were conceded. On the other hand, he wrote, non-compliance with these simple and vital demands would mean civil disobedience. Other nations might have other and different means but for India, he declared, there was no other way but nonviolent non-cooperation.

The Independence Day was observed with great eclat throughout India. Gandhi was able to measure through this demonstration the pent up energy of the nation. The Working Committee met at Sabarmati on 14 February 1930 and the following days. It authorized Gandhi to start civil disobedience and in the manner he thought best. This time the Working Committee laid down an important principle. It said that civil disobedience for the purpose of achieving Pūrṇa Svarāj should be initiated and controlled by those who believed in nonviolence as an article of faith. Shortly after, the A.I.C.C. also met at Ahmedabad in March 1930 and sanctioned the campaign of civil disobedience.

Even while the Working Committee was in session in February, Gandhi was already contemplating a breach of the Salt Laws which

were a disgrace to India. He wrote to the Viceroy his historic letter on the 2nd of March stating fully the case for Indian *svarāj* and the basis of his impending campaign. The Viceroy replied promptly regretting the step that Gandhi was taking. But it was inevitable and with a select band of 79, Gandhi started from Sabarmati Ashram on foot for Dandi in the Surat District on 12 March 1930. The stretch is one of 200 miles and it was to be covered in about twenty-four days. The party was to reach Dandi before the 6th of April, which had been fixed as the day for the ceremonial civil breach of the Salt Law by Gandhi. Nobody else was to break the law before that day.

As days passed and Gandhi approached his destination, the tempo in the country rose and thousands prepared themselves to face sufferings and sacrifice. Gandhi reached Dandi on 5 April 1930. He picked up a pinch of untaxed salt the next day and broke the law. Simultaneously millions in India did the same on that and subsequent days and dared the penalties with a smile on their lips. Repression had already begun through ordinance-*rāj* but the *lāthī* was yet to arrive on the scene. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was arrested in the first week of March and sentenced to three months' imprisonment. Sen Gupta of Bengal had been arrested before Gandhi reached Dandi. The long drawn Meerut Conspiracy trial was in progress. Several other arrests for making seditious speeches and writings had taken place. Gandhi himself expected his arrest any moment and gave instructions in the usual way through an article entitled 'If I am arrested'. He exhorted the people to go ahead with the civil disobedience programme but to stick to nonviolence at any cost. As he marched along, about two hundred patels resigned in the villages along the route.

The Government had already begun to lose temper. During the National Week there were firings in Peshawar, Madras and some other places. The police behaved brutally in Ratnagiri, Patna, Shiroda, Calcutta, Sholapur, and so many other towns and villages. They had taken to belabouring people regularly in the Madras presidency. That showed that the Government would throw legal forms to the winds and take to brutal measures, *lāthī* charges, and injure people wantonly without any legal sanction. The Bengal Ordinance was renewed on 23 April 1930. A press ordinance revived the powers of the Press Act of 1910. Gandhi's *Young India* had to appear in the form of cyclostyled sheets. Gandhi wrote that India was living under a veiled Martial Law and that India was but a vast prison house.

For some reason or other Gandhi was not arrested for about a month. Therefore, he pitched his camp at Karadi and carried on propaganda among the villagers to break the Salt Law overtly. He then wrote to the Viceroy that he was planning to raid the Dharasana salt pans and take possession of them. He mentioned that it was public property and that the Government had no right to tax salt. The people, Gandhi said, ought to get free salt. He also allowed the felling of palm trees which were the source of fermented toddy. He himself laid the first axe at the root of a palm. This programme caught the imagination of the people and in certain parts, for instance in Karnatak, it became common.

Then suddenly at dead of night on the 4th of May 1930 Gandhi was arrested and taken to Yeravda. Very few knew of it till he was safely within the walls of the great prison. His parting message was 'Die without killing'.

Abbas Tyabji took charge and carried on, and he was arrested on the 12th of May, when the command passed to Sarojini Devi.

The raids on Dharasana, Wadala, Shiroda, and Sanikatta salt depots and pans in Gujarat, Bombay, Maharashtra and Karnatak went on. The Dharasana raid was witnessed by a number of foreign correspondents and by impartial observers in India. The volunteers there wrote new history with their blood. The marvellous endurance and discipline of the nonviolent raiders at Dharasana and Wadala drew unstinted and unqualified praise from eminent foreigners like Mr Brailsford and Mr Slocombe. On the 21st of May, 2,500 volunteers raided the salt pans at Dharasana. Two hundred and ninety were injured by lathi charges. Two of them subsequently died. Fifteen thousand people, volunteers and non-volunteers, raided the Wadala pans. About 150 were injured by lathis. At Sanikatta ten to fifteen thousand people in a mass raided the salt depot and carried away hundreds of maunds of salt. But the point in a satyāgraha raid is not the amount of material removed but the bold, defiant, open action resorted to by the masses without any intention of using violence or counter-violence but with a definite idea about the suffering involved and of the right vindicated.

Mr Webb Miller of *New Freeman* wrote about Dharasana as follows. 'During eighteen years of reporting . . . I have never witnessed such harrowing scenes as at Dharasana. Sometimes the scenes were so painful that I had to turn away momentarily. One surprising feature was the discipline of the volunteers. It seemed they were

thoroughly imbued with Gandhi's nonviolent creed.' There was not a single case of retaliation or counter-violence or even crushing. And this went on for days.

Though people showed such exemplary patience and conducted themselves quite nonviolently, the police and the military acted most brutally and inhumanly against unarmed thousands that were ready to sacrifice themselves and shed their blood for their country. Many times even the innocent spectators were hit hard and hundreds of them were injured. The Government set in motion about a dozen ordinances and by the end of the year they had declared hundreds of Congress Committees unlawful. Lathi was the new weapon that the Government had been using since the beginning of the movement in 1930. What was really legal and legitimate was the imprisonment of persons who civilly disobeyed the law. But the Government found that procedure impracticable on account of the vast numbers that took part in law-breaking activities. Therefore the Government invented the lathi under the plea that they were using the minimum amount of force, though on the opposite side there was not even a show of force. But the irony is that mostly the 'minimum' amounted to wounding hundreds at each bout and sometimes wounding many of them quite seriously, till they were unconscious. It was impossible to keep a record of the lathi charges which became a regular feature of police action everywhere during the movement.

Firing on crowds was freely indulged in. An authentic record of it is furnished by Government itself. In answer to a question by S.C. Mitra in the Central Assembly the Hon. Mr H.G. Haig furnished a table (L.A. Debate, 14-7-1930, Vol. IV, No. 6, p. 237) in which it was stated that during April and May alone firing took place at nineteen places and that the number of dead was 111 and the number wounded 422. This gives the reader an idea of the methods used to suppress a wholly nonviolent movement. It will not be out of place to recall that the Labour Party with Mr Ramsay MacDonald as the Prime Minister was in power in Britain at that time.

The story of this civil disobedience movement will not be complete without mentioning the attempts at compromise by third parties. An abortive attempt was made by Mr Slocombe. He had permission to see Gandhi and he took certain proposals from him to the Viceroy. But Mr Slocombe was disappointed with the attitude of the Viceroy. Then in June, July and August Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr M.R. Jayakar tried to bring about a compromise. The Nehrus and some

other members of the Working Committee were brought to Yeravda to hold consultations with Gandhi. But all came to nothing. Mr Horace Alexander's attempts also were to no purpose.

The Round Table Conference, which was convened in spite of the happenings in India, in a way speeded up Gandhi's release. Gandhi found himself out of prison on 26 January 1931, along with some 26 of his colleagues. Then began negotiations which ultimately ended in the Gandhi-Irwin pact on 5 March 1931.

Mutual goodwill on the part of Lord Irwin and Gandhi was responsible for the successful termination of the negotiations. But later it became evident that the British Government had no intention to part with real power. The pact was a moral victory for the Congress and its principle of nonviolence. There were also some slight material advantages. But beyond that, India did not make any advance in getting political power. Shortly another struggle was forced upon her under more unfavourable conditions.

Reviewing the whole situation, we find that the movement lasted exactly for a year from 4 March 1930 to 4 March 1931. Nationalist India waged this relentless struggle and faced untold suffering and losses cheerfully and did not even dream of retaliating or indulging in violence. The British Government, on the other hand, armed to the teeth with all modern weapons sought to crush the very spirit of India with the help of ordinances, the lathi, and other methods of terrorism. The police and the military in many cases did not show even ordinary courtesy, not to speak of chivalry. Ladies for the first time took part in this movement on a big scale and thousands were jailed, lathi-charged, and otherwise harshly treated. Some of them were taken to the jungle and left there at odd hours.

The main forms of satyāgraha that were current during this struggle were the civil breach of Salt Laws, nonviolent raids on salt pans and depots, breach of the ordinances, no-tax campaigns in certain parts of India, civil breach of the Press Laws, boycott of foreign articles and cloth, special boycott of British cloth and British concerns, general non-cooperation with Government, and boycott of the legislatures. The campaign marked a distinct moral victory which created self-confidence among the people and confidence in the weapon of satyāgraha. The pact that came at the end led the way to the participation of the Congress in the Round Table Conference.

CHAPTER 28

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AGAIN

The Gandhi-Irwin Agreement which was signed on the 5th of March 1931, would have been a document of the greatest importance in history, not only of satyāgraha but of India, if it had been observed by the powers that be both in Delhi and at Whitehall. But it was broken even before the ink on it was dry.

Lord Willingdon who had succeeded Lord Irwin seemed to be in no mood to respect the spirit which animated the agreement. Breaches of the pact were reported in many places. There were complaints from both sides. But while Congressmen took their complaints both to the Government and the Congress, Government officials acted on their own, without reference to the Congress whenever they thought there had been a breach of the pact. While the Congress had suspended civil Disobedience, the Government retained its right to put the law in motion at its will and pleasure. Firings and lathi charges were reported from Guntur and Vedapalli. Prosecutions for speeches and writings went on merrily.

Gandhi had in the meantime left for England to attend the Round Table Conference after much suspense and uncertainty. His fears came true, for the R.T.C. proved a total failure and Gandhi returned to see an India under ordinance-raj which Lord Willingdon had so ruthlessly put in motion. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was arrested on his way to receive Gandhi. Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan was put behind prison bars before Gandhi landed.

The Working Committee met on the day on which Gandhi landed in India. The Committee was in session till 3 January 1932. Gandhi entered into telegraphic correspondence with the Viceroy, but Lord Willingdon was in no mood to compromise. Even Gandhi's request for an interview was granted only under conditions to which Gandhi, in all conscience, could not agree. The question of promulgation of ordinances, said the Viceroy, was a closed one, but as regards other matters Gandhi was free to see him. Gandhi in a spirited reply pointed out that the constitutional issue dwindled into insignificance before what was actually being done by the Government. He added that he would have to advise the country to resume civil disobe-

dience unless the Viceroy reconsidered his telegram, and was ready to grant adequate relief in respect of ordinances and some of the acts of the Government, and unless free scope was allowed to the Congress to press its claims for complete independence in any future negotiations, and unless the administration of the country was carried on in consultation with the representatives of the country, pending the attainment of independence.

A resolution to this effect was passed by the Working Committee on the last day of the year 1931. The Committee called upon the nation to resume civil disobedience, which embraced non-payment of taxes, if a satisfactory response was not forthcoming from the Viceroy. Very great stress was laid on nonviolence.

The Viceroy's reply was disappointing. After a further exchange of telegrams which proved futile, the Government struck. Gandhi and Sardar Patel were arrested and hundreds of Congress Committees, national schools, Kisan Committees, Seva Dals and allied organizations were declared unlawful. Their premises were occupied, their furniture and other property seized, and later sold. About 15,000 prominent Congressmen throughout India were picked up and jailed. Ordinance rule was the order of the day, with the lathi and the baton very much in evidence. Soon the jails of the country were filled to capacity with more than a lakh imprisoned. Nearly four times that number were dealt with by the lathi. Every attempt at nonviolent resistance was sought to be broken down. Ras in Gujarat, and Ankola and Siddhapur in Karnatak, launched no-tax campaigns and were the places to suffer most. Repression was more thorough and ruthless than in 1930-1931.

On 12 September 1932, all of a sudden the country woke up to read the news that Gandhi was going to fast unto death over the question of the Communal Award which had proposed separate electorates for the Harijans. This naturally diverted the attention of the people. Gandhi commenced the fast on 20 September 1932, and broke it only when the Poona Pact, which restored joint electorates to Harijans, was signed on the 26th.

Civil disobedience went on but the removal of untouchability received more serious attention. Babu Rajendra Prasad, the acting President of the Congress, was arrested on 6 January 1933 for calling upon the people to continue the fight. Shri Aney succeeded Rajendra Babu. Then came news of Gandhi's purificatory fast when the Government released him. The movement was suspended temporarily

for nine weeks. Ultimately after a meeting of Congress workers in Poona on 12 July 1933, mass Civil Disobedience continued. Attempts at reconciliation with the Government failed.

Gandhi, by an act of supreme sacrifice, gave up his Ashram and declared that he would start for the village Ras with 34 Ashramites to offer individual Civil Disobedience. But he was arrested and later released on condition that he would leave the place. Gandhi of course, could not obey such restrictions, and was again arrested and sentenced to a year's imprisonment. In prison, Gandhi asked for certain facilities to carry on Harijan work and on the Government's refusal, went on a fast. He was released in the third week of August 1933. Gandhi, however, decided not to take an active part in politics for the period which he would have had to spend in jail, if he had not been released.

Ultimately, on 7 April 1934 Gandhi decided to suspend even individual Civil Disobedience, restricting to himself the right to resist. On 18 May 1934 the A.I.C.C. which met at Patna accepted his recommendation. The Svarāj Party was again revived and a decision to contest the Central Assembly elections was again reached.

Since the movement of 1932-1934 was in a way a continuation of the 1930-1931 movement, there were a number of features common to both of them and a comparison may be interesting.

In 1930 Gandhi began with the breach of the Salt Law and exhorted the people to break it extensively but always openly and with a readiness to face the penalties. The Salt Law was broken in a hundred ways, and on a gigantic scale. Untaxed salt was picked, used and sold. Salt pans and salt depots were raided. Open markets of contraband salt were held in Ankola.

On the eve of his arrest in 1930, Gandhi gave a message in which he said that whole villages should pick and manufacture salt. Women should picket liquor shops, drug shops, and foreign-cloth shops. He asked Government servants to resign, students to leave their schools and join the movement, patels and talātis to refuse to help the Government.

After Gandhi's arrest, the Working Committee expanded still further the scope of the movement. It called upon people to make the boycott of foreign cloth complete success. It urged not to pay revenue and the chowkidari tax. Forest laws were to be broken for the benefit of the people living nearby. British banking, shipping and insurance houses were sought to be effectively boycotted. The Work-

ing Committee which met at Allahabad on 27 June 1930, asked the people to enforce strict social boycott of all government officials and others known to have participated directly in the atrocities committed upon the people to stifle the national movement. This however was not approved later by Gandhi. People were asked not to buy or accept any fresh bonds of the Government, not to accept silver or currency notes as legal tender but to insist on gold wherever possible. The Committee declared that it was the duty of the police and the military not to help the Government in its atrocious policy towards the people.

In the 1932-1934 satyāgraha the emphasis on nonviolence was greater than ever before. Boycott of foreign cloth was obligatory, boycott of liquor and other intoxicants was emphasized and was to be achieved by picketing, especially by women. If processions or meetings were banned, only such were asked to join as would stand lathi charges or bullets. Civil breach of non-moral laws, and breach of unjust orders under the ordinances were advised.

All the ordinances were disobeyed openly and the penalties suffered cheerfully. Prohibitory orders by local officers such as those under Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code were disobeyed. No-tax and no-rent campaigns were launched in certain areas. In some areas the Chowkidari tax was refused. Punitive taxes imposed in some places were challenged. Forest laws were disobeyed by vast masses. Palm trees were cut down in thousands. Specific days like the Flag Day, Gandhi Day, Motilal Day, Martyrs' Day, Sholapur Day, Independence Day, Frontier Day, Garhwalis' Day were observed in defiance of legal restrictions. Raids on salt depots and on Congress Houses occupied by the police were organized. Two Congress Sessions were held in spite of the ban, once in April 1932 in Delhi and once more in April 1933 in Calcutta. Both the Sessions were attended by hundres of delegates from all over India. Many were arrested before they reached the venue of the Congress. Similarly some provincial conferences and other conferences were organized.

On both occasions, the Government came down with a heavy hand, though in the beginning of 1930 the government did not immediately declare the Congress Committees unlawful. Nor did they then spirit away the Congress leaders en masse. But without in the least respecting the nonviolent nature of the movement, the police brought into play all the brutal methods they were capable of. Beating

even by rushing into private houses, torturing, huddling up people for days in lock-ups, twisting the hands for snatching salt, leaving ladies in out-of-the-way places, and numerous other instances of excesses and atrocities were in evidence.

CHAPTER 29

ANTI-WAR SATYĀGRAHA

Each one of the nation-wide satyāgrahas that have been described before has a characteristic of its own. The object of the satyāgraha campaigns expanded progressively. The forms of satyāgraha also differed according to time and circumstances. If the repeal of a single pernicious Act was the object of the satyāgraha in 1919, the removal of the Panjab and the Khilāfat wrongs was the object of the next movement. The direct object of the third as well as the fourth satyāgraha—the fourth being only a continuation of the third—was Pūrna Swarāj. The individual satyāgraha campaign of 1940 was in a type by itself. The life and death struggle in which England was engaged and the general non-embarrassment policy followed by the Congress practically decided the form of satyāgraha to be adopted. It was called ‘Individual Satyāgraha’ because chosen men with certain definite qualifications alone were eligible to offer satyāgraha. It was also ‘representative’ because mostly representatives of the people, whether in the legislatures or local bodies, or Congress Committees or public life were asked to offer satyāgraha and they did so.

One of the questions often asked is how Gandhi, the advocate of non-embarrassment of the opponent, sponsored a movement which involved at least some embarrassment. To this Gandhi replied in his speech at the Bombay session of the A.I.C.C. The virtue of waiting, he said, was becoming a vice. Several alternatives had been suggested to the British Government. It was asked to declare Indian independence. It evaded the question. It was asked to give India a constitution framed by a Constituent Assembly. The idea had been laughed out. It was offered full armed cooperation if India's independence was recognized. Even that offer was rejected. In fact so far no response was forthcoming from the Government. The exercise of restraint was good enough but when it threatened the very existence of the spirit which enabled one to exercise that self-restraint, then that virtue became a vice. Gandhi said: ‘I am not only speaking for the Congress but for all who stand for national freedom, unadulterated independence. I should be untrue to all of them if I said now “No embarrassment to the British.”; therefore if I

exercised that self-suppression at this critical moment it should be suicidal.'

It was in such an atmosphere that the movement took shape. The demand was: 'Simply declare that India is free to carry on nonviolently and openly anti-war propaganda, that India is free to preach non-cooperation with the Government in their war effort, and we will have no civil disobedience.' If even this was not accepted then the Congress could not but act.

Prosecutions, not because people preached violence, but even for their explaining the Ramgarh resolution on war, were taking place all over India. Gandhi said: 'We cannot sit still. It is not satyāgraha to watch the people being marched to jail in the exercise of their right to freedom of speech. If we looked on, the Congress would disappear and with it the national spirit.'

This was the origin of the 'Individual Satyāgraha' movement.

Gandhi interviewed the Viceroy on 27 and 30 September 1940. But the Viceroy could not concede his demand for freedom to preach the war-policy of the Congress in a nonviolent manner, and for freedom to tell people not to help the war-effort as all war was evil and destructive in nature. The Viceroy said that he would allow the same freedom to Congressmen in India that was given to conscientious objectors in Britain but could not go further.

In Britain, conscientious objectors were exempt from conscription and were even allowed to profess their faith in public but were not permitted to carry their opposition to the length of endeavouring to persuade others to abandon their allegiance to war or to discontinue their war-effort. But the situation in India was different, and Gandhi told the Viceroy frankly that his concessions were not sufficient in the conditions of India. He declared that if the Congress was to die, it should die in the act of proclaiming its faith in the principle of peaceful methods.

Then followed the inauguration of the satyāgraha campaign. Gandhi laid down very strict rules and drew up a pledge. He wanted 'quality' this time. He said he would not offer civil disobedience himself as that would cause much embarrassment. He chose Vinoba Bhave, an ideal choice, as the first satyāgrahī. Vinoba had specialized in spinning in every manner, had abolished untouchability from the village in which he lived, was a firm believer in Hindu-Muslim unity, had an army of disciples and workers, and was a believer in the necessity of independence. At the same time he believed in the possi-

bility of obtaining independence through constructive work, with khādi as the centre. Further he believed that constructive work with civil disobedience was more effective than any crowded political programme. Above all he was a war-resister. At Paunar on 17 October 1940 Vinoba made a public speech in which he preached the Congress war-policy and exhorted the people not to help the war-effort as all war was immoral and bad. He was arrested after he had been making speeches for four days and was sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

Gandhi gave directions to some Congressmen to march on foot towards Delhi, explaining on their way the Congress war-policy. Hundreds started, but many were arrested and sentenced on the way in their own provinces.

Later Gandhi prescribed that instead of speeches and statements, satyāgrahīs should repeat a slogan that it was wrong to help the British war-effort with men and money, that nonviolence was the best way of resisting all wars, and that they should thus offer themselves for arrest.

On this issue, about 30,000 people courted jail and six lakhs of rupees was recovered as fine. Satyāgrahīs gave notice to the Magistrate concerned indicating the time, place and manner of satyāgraha. Some of the satyāgrahīs wrote letters to the members of the War Committees requesting them to resign.

It is significant that most of the Congress representatives in the Legislatures, Central and Provincial, in District Boards and Municipalities, in Congress organizations and in public life found themselves in jail in this campaign. The figures are as follows: 11 members of the Congress Working Committee, 176 members of the A.I.C.C., 29 ex-Ministers, 22 members of the Central Legislature, and 400 members of the Provincial Legislatures. From that point of view, this satyāgraha may be said to have been the most representative one.

When some were released during the year 1941-1942. Gandhi asked them to offer satyāgraha again. There is the case of an M.L.A. from the C.P. who offered himself five times, though later the Government ceased to send him to jail but began to fine him. He was fined in the aggregate about ten thousand rupees.

During this satyāgraha the police or the Government do not seem to have hit below the belt. This satyāgraha continued till the end of 1941. By that time enthusiasm had waned. In the meanwhile, the Viceroy's Executive Council had been expanded and more Indians

were taken in. Without any initiative on the part of the Congress, on account of the pressure of opinion of other parties, the Government of India released the satyāgrahīs on 4 December 1941. They took it for granted, without any grounds, that the Congress also would begin to help the war-effort.

The Working Committee and the A.I.C.C. which met at Wardha in January 1942 did not revive the struggle but laid stress on self-defence and self-sufficiency in face of the imminent danger of invasion of India by the Japanese.

'QUIT INDIA' MOVEMENT

This chapter refers practically to current history. The events leading to what proved to be a cataclysm in the history of Indo-British relations can, however, be narrated in brief.

In December 1941, Japanese planes swooped on Pearl Harbour. It was a terrific blow to American naval power, no doubt, but by this one act Japan forced America to enter the lists along with the Allies and join the fray which she had been watching with sympathetic interest. The enormous industrial and financial resources of America were arrayed against the Axis. But for the moment the Japanese marched from town to town and stepped from island to island at a pace which seemed unbelievable even to a world which had known the blitzkrieg methods of the Wehrmacht at the height of its might in Germany.

The soldiers of Nippon were marching across Burma; General Alexander was leading a defeated army back to India. Japanese bombs had fallen on Indian soil. Never before was the prestige of the Empire at a lower ebb.

It was at this time that Sir Stafford Cripps, the man who was reputed to have brought Russia into the war and was considered the likely successor to Winston Churchill, flew to India with his scheme of political reform. Sir Stafford began his work in auspicious circumstances. He was a good friend of Pandit Nehru, whose guest he had been on a previous visit. His views on the Indian problem breathed an air of freshness and his radicalism was in sympathy with the aspirations of Young India. Moreover, his method of approach was something novel and when he left the Viceregal lodge and began interviewing the leaders and parties in a private house, people really believed that something was brewing.

But what a disappointment! The Churchillian impress was stamped indelibly in the Cripps Proposals. Gandhi promptly described it as a 'post-dated cheque'. It promised tons of food in the indefinite future to an India which hungered for a morsel here and now. And yet Maulana Azad and Pandit Nehru carried on negotiations. Report had it that they came within an inch of agreement. The talks broke

down on the issue of defence and the constitution of the Interim Government. Maulana Azad and Pandit Nehru felt definitely that Cripps favoured a National Government in fact, if not in name, which would act as a cabinet with the Viceroy remaining as the constitutional head, like the King of England. Cripps, however, in his last statement maintained that he never agreed to any major departure from the present constitution and said that the National Government proposed by the Congress would put in power an irresponsible Executive irremovable for all practical purposes.

Sir Stafford left India in a huff. It was not the Congress alone that rejected his proposals. All the other parties in the country rejected them. As Cripps left, bitterness and anger filled the Indian atmosphere and anti-British feeling reached its climax.

At this psychological moment, Gandhi began the 'Quit India' campaign. He saw that the parting of the ways had come and if India was to defend herself and help China and Russia, she must free herself of the enervating influence of British Imperialism. In a series of articles in the *Harijan* he voiced the nation's feelings and the campaign gathered momentum. Gandhi did not object to the presence of the allied armies in India during the war. But what he insisted upon was that they should remain here only on the sufferance of a free India.

The Working Committee met in July 1942 at Wardha and gave shape to Gandhi's ideas. The Committee passed a resolution calling upon Britain to withdraw from India. The resolution said that if the appeal failed, Congress would then be reluctantly compelled to utilize all its nonviolent strength for the vindication of the political rights and the liberty of India, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. The issue was referred to the A.I.C.C. which met on 7 and 8 August in Bombay.

The A.I.C.C. after giving due consideration to all points of view endorsed the Working Committee resolution. The operative part of the A.I.C.C. resolution said: 'The Committee resolves, therefore, to sanction for the vindication of India's inalienable right to freedom and independence, the starting of a mass struggle on nonviolent lines on the widest possible scale, so that the country might utilize all the nonviolent strength it has gathered during the last 22 years of peaceful struggle. Such a struggle must inevitably be under the leadership of Gandhi.'

Gandhi in his speech mentioned that he was in no hurry and that

he would seek an opportunity to see the Viceroy and negotiate with him. But before the next day dawned Gandhi and all the Working Committee members were arrested. Within a week every one who mattered in the organization was arrested and locked up without trial. Then followed the rule by ordinances, firings, lathi charges, and even bombings from aeroplanes were reported from some places. At some centres, people, driven to desperation, attacked railways and the police. The Government states that on the whole about 56 people succumbed to the fury of the mob.

It is estimated that more than 2000 unarmed and innocent people were shot down and about 6000 injured by the police and the military; tens of thousands wounded by lathis; about 1,50,000 were jailed and about 15 lakhs of rupees were imposed as collective fines; there is no record of tortures, burning of houses, looting and other atrocities by the police and the military.

This is not the time nor the occasion to pronounce judgement on these events. But the mass awakening and mass revolt witnessed throughout India and the predominantly nonviolent way vast masses conducted themselves during the struggle, apart from a few acts of unorganized violence, were something remarkable and incomparable with anything in past history. What shape the movement would have taken in Gandhi's hands is another matter. But the way in which people faced brutal terrorism even without his guidance and without the guidance of any important leader, and carried on the struggle for months is worth studying from the point of view of social dynamics. It will ever remain an important chapter in the history of nonviolent resistance if not of pure and unadulterated satyāgraha.

APPENDIX 1

OBSERVATIONS BY MASHRUWALA

In the following pages¹ my brother Ranganath Diwakar has given a brief account of how satyāgraha, in its current Indian form, first revealed itself to Gandhiji and how it grew with him and through him in South Africa and India during the last forty years or so. He had dealt with the subject and with most of its major aspects fully enough. It would be wasting the reader's time if I traversed the same ground again. So what I write here is more in the nature of a few independent observations on what has already been said in the book than a formal appreciation or evaluation of the author's efforts.

Gandhi has explained satyāgraha as soul-force or spiritual force or the force which accrues to one out of a living faith in God. This last he regards as indispensable for the success of nonviolence.

'He or she must have a living faith in nonviolence. This is impossible without a living faith in God. A nonviolent man can do nothing save by the power and grace of God. Without it he won't have the courage to die without anger, without fear and without retaliation.' (*Harijan* 18-6-1938)

Again, speaking before the Gandhi Seva Sangh, he said:

'Now a satyāgrahī should have a living faith in God. That is because he has no other strength but that of his unflinching faith in Him. Without that faith, how can he undertake satyāgraha?' (*Harijan* 13-5-1939)

'To bear all kinds of tortures without a murmur of resentment is impossible for a human being without the strength that comes from God. Only in His strength are we strong. And only those who can cast their cares and their fears on that Immeasurable Power have faith in God.' (*Harijan*, 3-6-1939)

If further guidance were necessary, Gandhiji would explain God by saying that God is Truth, or Truth is God, that He is God of Love and Nonviolence, and not of Hatred and War, that soul-force or spiritual force is the opposite of brute force, and so on. He would also say: 'God sits in the hearts of all, (so) there should be no fear in the presence of God. The knowledge of the omnipresence of

God also means respect for the lives of even those who may be called opponents or goondas.' 'Living faith in the God of Love' implies 'equal love for all mankind'. (All these quotations are from one or another of the issues of *Harijan* above referred to.)

This exposition is understood by a person of any persuasion whatever as plain and sufficient. Until he is obsessed by a so-called philosophical or theological bias, he seems to understand all the terms of God, spirit, soul, brute, nonviolence, hatred, etc. with their imports and distinctions as well as he understands the terms sweet and bitter, hunger and thirst, friendliness and enmity and the distinctions between them. And since he understands the language, he finds sufficient guidance from it for putting into practice what he is told, relying upon his own commonsense in the ordinary affairs of life.

But once a person is introduced into the subtleties of philosophical and theological dialectic, he begins to lose himself in the wood. My feeling is that there is something fundamentally wrong in the way in which philosophy and theology have evolved both in India and outside. The various schools have caused more confusion than clarity.

As a result of it, a great many men of letters find Gandhi's references to God, soul, spirit, nonviolence, truth, etc., and also, therefore, his message of satyāgraha very difficult to understand. They think that there is either something subtle and deliberately evasive, or crude and unclear in his expositions. My own feeling is that the difficulty in understanding the man and the subject arises from our trying to approach it in a wrong manner. A subject which for appreciation demands a direct approach and practice does not lend itself to discussion beyond a point. A person who has not tasted anything sweet, cannot know sweetness even by its most exact and scientific definition; still less is it possible for him to know the difference between the sweetness of jaggery and of sugar; and if he refuses to know it by directly tasting a sweet thing, although he may be one of the greatest scientists of the world, he may never understand sweet things in the manner a child which has tasted them does.

The consequence is that there are as many systems of philosophy as there are brains with a gift for inventing hypotheses. At one end there are those who are definite that there is no such thing as spirit, or soul, or God, but that there is only one material principle at the root of all existence. At the other end are those who declare that

there is no such thing as matter, but that everything is spirit. With the former, the so-called soul-force or force of nonviolence is just expedient tactics, with a materialistic interpretation. There need be no superstitious adoration of it. With the latter, the brute force of a lion, or of the bomb and its inventors, is as much spiritual, as the force of nonviolent suffering of a Socrates, a Jesus, a Prahlāda, or a Gandhi. Both seem to conclude that there is no reason to make any distinction between the one or the other type of direct action, except what may be dictated by considerations of expediency. Both feel that although the satyāgraha method for achieving the independence of India might be excellent for our times, Gandhi's universalization of it is certainly un-understandable. I often come across young men, armed with university learning, who say: 'Gandhiji's constant reference to God, truth and nonviolence is nauseating; it stinks in our nostrils.' And I have also met grave elderly Vedanta philosophers who, with all their appreciation for the godwardness of the Mahatma, have regretted his ignorance (ajñāna) about the true nature of the Spirit, which is beyond violence and nonviolence, truth and falsehood and similar other opposite qualities. They have desired to impart to him true spiritual knowledge, so that he may reach that egoless (nirahamkāra) stage which would enable him to destroy, if necessary, even the whole world, without attachment (and so without compunction too?) and thus release his, and with him, India's immense energy which is at present confined in the shell of nonviolence! And between these two, there are so many other teachers of philosophy and religion, who maintain that Gandhiji's total abhorrence of violence is in accordance with neither philosophy nor religion. Indeed, at times there is a curious rivalry among adherents of different religion—including Jainism and Buddhism—each trying to prove that violence was not totally prohibited by their religion, but that there were occasions when violence was holy and a *dharma* (religious duty).

The layman, who erstwhile did not doubt the soundness of Gandhi's teaching, after hearing these lerrned discussions feels confused.

How shall we then proceed to explain it?

I shall think aloud and give a picture of the working of my mind, which, though it owes its evolution to a number of philosophical and religious influences, is unattached now to any known system of religion or philosophy and owns no scripture as absolutely binding

upon it. I shall try to approach the force and ethics of satyāgraha by directly examining its working in myself and other satyāgrahis known to history, to find out the species of energy working behind its outward exhibition.

Every person possesses in him a power or strength of mind, which enables him to confine in regulated and restrained channels his pursuit of worldly good and mental or sensual comforts and pleasures. He does not altogether abjure these but has enough strength of mind to go without them, if in obtaining them he has to transgress the limits accepted by him. Not until he has somehow persuaded himself to disregard or change that boundary line, does his strength of mind fail him. I call this strength of mind a person's moral force. This force is independent of his civilization, in terms of scientific, economic, or literary progress. It is also independent of his reasoning faculties and philosophical scholarship. The limits may have been prescribed by him or by those who have influenced his life. They may be very low in a first-class statesman, scientist or literateur, and very high in an illiterate or a naked aboriginal. In times of stress like famine, war, pestilence and extreme poverty, this force may have an ebb. But there is none who has not some sense or understanding of it and its nucleus. Though often associated with religion and philosophy, it has no necessary relation with either. Indeed, there exist religious and philosophical systems which undermine the natural nucleus and teach the disciple to disregard its reaction on his unsophisticated understanding.

I shall not speculate about the fundamental basis of this force. It is sufficient to examine the force at the stage when it is perceptibly felt by a normal man. And at that stage, we find it based on an innate desire to be good or right in our own person and conduct, and towards the world we come in contact with. There is a desire to be personally happy and there is also the desire to be good. Both generate activity. And the desire to be good creates an activity which acts as a controller on the desire to be personally happy. The desire to be good may otherwise be paraphrased as the desire to be clean in one's own life and methods, and just, friendly and helpful towards all: in Gandhiji's language, to feel and be nonviolent. The stronger this desire becomes than the desire to seek personal happiness, the stronger will be his moral force.

Besides this moral force, there is also another force in man, which, though not always active, is potentially present in every

human being, and when aroused, releases tremendous energy in him. It enables him to sacrifice or resignedly suffer loss of all worldly gifts and comforts, loss of dear ones, and, if necessary, bear tortures even unto death. When in full operation the force destroys the natural instinct of fear and imparts to him a new purpose in life and a missionary zeal to fulfil it. The awakening of this force—its conversion from a potential state into a dynamic one—is the precursor of every revolution, religious, political, or any other. It is difficult to say how and when at first this force is awakened in the first man. It may be awakened even by accident and in a person least expected to be suitable for it. But it is infectious and catches others. And those who have caught it become its instruments and propagators. It is a force which generates indomitable will in the awakened individual and society, and may be called the 'vital force'.

This force, however, does not always act in unison with the moral force and without the latter the former is like a motor car driven by a driver, who knows where he wants to go, but does not care to see whom he injures on the way and will not use the brake. He knows his objective and is determined to accomplish it, but does not care by what method. We may cite several examples of the working of this force. For instance, it was Hitler's vital force that turned Germany into a mighty power in less than a generation; it was the vital force of Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt that changed what might have become a total defeat of the Allies into their victory. And in our own country, a tug of war has been going on for more than a generation now between the vital force of British Imperialists on the one hand and that of the Indian nation, expressed through the National Congress, on the other, the former trying to wipe the latter out of existence, and the nation's will to be free endeavouring to become stronger and stronger at every step. But the vital force of Hitler, Churchill, Stalin, Roosevelt, or the leaders of British Imperialism is not credited with or claimed as the power of satyāgraha; while that of the National Congress has been so claimed, at least to the extent of the intention and endeavour of its author.

Wherein lies the difference?

Neither Hitler, nor Churchill and others considered themselves bound to desist from adopting any means which promised them success. Indeed, as we know, the premier democratic country and the richest and most powerful state of the world ultimately perpetrated the most heinous crime known to history in order to achieve it.

Their vital force was as devoid of a moral brake as the force of the atomic bomb they had manufactured. And this is the fundamental difference between a mere vital force and the force of satyāgraha.

The big powers felt no unflinching loyalty to the innate urge in man to be clean in one's own life and methods, and just, friendly and serving towards all, that is to say, to feel and be nonviolent. They had no 'living faith', no 'ultimate stay' in moral force. Therefore it called into service all means—moral, immoral, or indifferent. The vital urge ultimately ended in converting itself into the energy of the atomic bomb!

Vital force that is not in adjustment with man's moral force is Satan or the force of Might. The same in unison with and having its ultimate stay in his moral force is satyāgraha. A high, righteous and just purpose, accompanied with an indomitable will is not by itself satyāgraha, if it is not also accompanied with the restraining force of not accomplishing it by anything that conflicts with man's urge to feel and be good or nonviolent.

The roots of the satyāgraha force are within every one of us. They are the awakened or the dormant vital force, which is unconquerable and which does not flinch from its set purpose, along and in unison with the moral force, which consists in complete loyalty to the urge for goodness. If we make a direct approach to these inherent roots within us, it should not be difficult to understand Gandhiji's religion-dressed language and his recurring emphasis on it.

Shri Diwakar has explained and exemplified various outward forms which the force of satyāgraha might take. I do not propose to discuss them here, but I shall dwell a little on the technique of fast, as it is a much misunderstood subject and is stoutly criticised as being a form of coercion. As everyone knows Gandhiji has a long list of satyāgraha fasts on his history-ticket. One of these is his historic fast in the Rajkot Satyāgraha. It was outwardly completely victorious. But almost immediately after its successful termination Gandhiji, as if to support the charge of his critics, declared it as vitiated by coercion, and followed up the self-condemnation by renouncement of the fruit of its victory. This, perhaps, led his opponents and general disbelievers in the method of fast-satyāgraha to imagine that Gandhiji would no longer use this weapon in future campaigns of satyāgraha. Perhaps they also breathed a sigh of relief. So, when Gandhiji again gave notice of three weeks' fast in February 1943 from the Aga Khan Camp Prison, the Viceroy (Lord Linlithgow), in his letter to Gandhiji

dated 5 February 1943, after taunting him that he (Gandhiji) was attempting 'to find an easy way out' said: 'I regard the use of fast for political purposes as a form of political blackmail (*himśā*) for which there can be no moral justification, and I understand from your own previous writings that this was also your view.' (*Gandhiji's Correspondence with the Government*, 1942-44, p. 37, 2nd edition).

'Blackmail' according to English dictionaries means '(force to make) payment for not revealing discreditable secrets etc.' or 'hush-money extorted under threat of exposure, especially of a baseless charge'. Since there was no question of any payment having been asked or of revealing any discreditable secrets of the Government or of exposing it to any charge, good or baseless (the charges, whatever they were, having been already made on both the sides), it is clear that the word has been used as a new figure of speech. Under the new use, a daughter-in-law shedding tears and refusing to take food as a protest against a charge brought by her mother-in-law, and regarded by her to be baseless, or a wife going on fast as a protest against her husband's ill-treatment towards her, would be guilty of blackmail!

We might also look at the word 'coerce'. According to English dictionaries an element of force, that is, a method which will arouse in the person sought to be coerced a fear that some harm will be done to him for failure to comply with the demand, is essential in coercion. As this is never present in a fast by a *satyāgrahī*, the application of this word in reference to a fast is as unusually figurative as the word blackmail. The resort to fasting may be very inconvenient and irritating to the person or authority against whom it is used, and more so, if the person fasting is more popular than himself and his cause is logically unanswerable and sympathetically looked upon by those whose goodwill the person in authority cannot altogether ignore. He may find himself on the horns of a dilemma, if, on the one hand, he does not wish to grant the fasting man's demand and, on the other, does not want to be in the wrong box in the eyes of the world, and does not know how to avoid it, without being obliged to do right—a thing for which he is not prepared. The creation of such an inconvenient situation for an opponent can be called coercion only as a word of abuse.

It is almost proverbial in Gujarati to say about a very dogged opponent, whom one does not like, that he was so wicked that he would 'cut his own nose in order to create a bad omen for his opponent'. Likewise Lord Linlithgow perhaps felt that Gandhiji was so

wicked that he would even kill himself in order to gain his point against the Government! But if invitation of suffering upon oneself is coercion or blackmail, then decidedly every form of satyāgraha is coercive and every demand accompanied with a threat to resort to self-suffering is blackmail. For there is no satyāgraha except for gaining some point, with the preparedness to suffer for it until it is gained. Being a moral substitute for violent methods of achieving the same purpose, what is sought to be gained in violence by inflicting suffering on the opponent is sought to be gained in satyāgraha by inviting suffering upon oneself. And being a moral substitute it is not accompanied, as violence is, with a shower of abuses on the opponent, but with an attempt to feel and be as good towards the opponent as one is capable of. Blackmail or coercion are never expected to invite self-suffering or to be done with a feeling to do or be good to the opponent.

What then was the element of coercion in the Rajkot fast? It will be remembered that a satyāgraha struggle was going on for some months between the people and the Ruler of Rajkot. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel led the people. In the course of the struggle an agreement was arrived at between the Ruler and the Sardar. But the Ruler repudiated the agreement almost immediately afterwards. At this stage Gandhiji intervened and pleaded with the Ruler and his advisers to honour the agreement. The effort failed. Thereupon, Gandhiji decided to resort to fast in order to arouse the Ruler's conscience, or, if you so wish to say, to bring moral pressure upon him. One would expect that a direct satyāgraha method having been chosen, it would be carried to its logical consequence. The Ruler would have yielded, or come to some other agreement, or allowed Gandhiji to die. But this was not done, and here 'a false step was taken by me [Gandhiji] thoughtlessly'. It consisted in seeking, as a sort of additional weapon of war in aid of the weapon of the fast, 'immediate intervention of the Paramount Power so as to induce fulfilment of the promise made by the Thakore Saheb'. The appeal to the Paramount Power succeeded. Lord Linlithgow intervened, with the result that the matter was referred to the arbitration of Sir Maurice Gwyer. He gave his award in favour of the satyāgrahīs. The Ruler had no alternative left but to yield. If he had decided to flout the award, the Paramount Power would have, assuming that it would have acted honestly, compelled him to abide by it, if necessary by use of force. It was thus a victory of the Paramount

and not of the fast; moreover, it rested on the *coercive strength* Paramount Power. If it was open to Gandhiji to try the rational method of appealing to the Paramount Power for the removal of the grievance, it might well be questioned whether it was wise to resort to direct action at all, until at least that method had been exhausted. If, on the other hand, there was a perfect case for direct action, why did he seek the intervention? Thus on both grounds his position was inconsistent with the principles of satyāgraha. As this became clear to Gandhiji he at once repented and as a final proof of repentance renounced the fruit of his victory. Gandhiji's greatness lay not in being infallible in the use of the technique discovered by himself, but in 'the courage to own his mistake and to atone for it by renouncing the fruits'. The mistake only shows that the duty to give, now and then, a goodbye to goodness should be regarded as a part of life's struggle in the world. A satyāgrahī will fail at times. His endeavour must, however, be again to return

Gandhakarji has devoted a whole chapter to the future of satyāgraha. I endorse his views, I would like to make a few observations on the subject in my own way.

Satyāgraha is a force as old as human culture, having a chequered history of evolution from immemorial times. As I have said above, we do not look upon might and goodness as always working for different ends, but as two inherent forces in the Spirit not always in perfect mutual adjustment. The result is that though seeming to work for the same end, they often are in conflict with each other. Might, being rudely aggressive, is prone to run away from goodness, while goodness is apt to be too weak to exercise a constant powerful check over might. More often, it intervenes to check might just as it is in its advance and then stops. Might thus gets a recurring opportunity to attain a terrifying height and velocity in its advance.

Nevertheless, might is never able to break away entirely from the influence of goodness. And just when might seems to be ruling supreme, the force of goodness somehow and suddenly begins to make its appearance from an unexpected quarter. Like most forces, though beginning might be imperceptibly small, it gathers momentum as it goes on, and ultimately acts with such tremendous force that the structures raised by might is pulled down as if by an earthquake. In spite of all its up-to-date and planned organization, might finds itself unable to resist the new energy born out of the sudden appearance of

goodness in a new form. It is like a planet which, trying to run away from one sun finds itself drawn up to another, either to be devoured by it or bound over to it. This is what we call 'revolution' in human history, and 're-establishment of dharma' in religion. After giving birth to a new civilization and nourishing it long enough to enable it to stand on its own legs, goodness again seems to become recessive, so that after a time the new era too again seems to run in pursuit of might. Thus human history is a record of the good, bad, or indifferent adjustments between the force of might and the force of goodness, and of the varying advance of the one or the other in different periods of history.

In our own times we are witness to the height to which this 'modern civilization' has grown, and also observe the great rapidity with which it is taking its strides from day to day. Might has again become haughty, fearless of opposition, regardless of moral values, and bent upon enforcing its will—good, bad, or indifferent. Though its language may be now and then, well-dressed, in effect it says to all the weak, subjugated and small nations of the world that they must either consent to remain as might may be pleased to keep them, or be no more. Of the nations from which modern civilization had least to fear was India.

But to the surprise of might, satyagraha has once more chosen an humble parent for being re-born. He is not only an Indian but the mildest of Indians, namely a Hindu. This book is a record of the doings of this new incarnation of satyagraha, under mainly the guardianship of its father, Mahatma Gandhi. It is new not only in its freshness, but also in its many sidedness and richness of technique.

The force is not going to be barren. It may well be the beginning of a new era, the starting point of a new world culture and civilization. But there is also the possibility, as ever, of the force of goodness being sent into retirement and that of might being accepted by new India. If history is destined simply to repeat itself, in course of time this seems inevitable. But if that is inevitable, inevitably again Satyagraha will seek a new birth, perhaps in a still lower stratum of society than that represented by Gandhiji.

I do not make these observations to indulge in speculations. My purpose is to discuss why the spirit of goodness constantly recedes into the background and allows the spirit of might to run amuck to the detriment of itself and the world. Is it inevitable in the very nature of the two forces? Or is it merely indicative of an imperfect

stage of evolution? Must might alone work in an organized, efficient, collective, active and alert manner, while goodness must generally work disorganizedly, inefficiently, individually, spasmodically, indolently and mostly negatively? Some, indeed, are of opinion that organizations, especially large ones, cannot be run without some adulteration with violence (*i.e.* might), and therefore nonviolence (*i.e.* goodness) must be content to work at best in small organizations, and efficiency, collective action and alertness must be necessarily kept within the limits of small organizations. Even the creation of small organizations must be regarded as a concession to weakness as no organization is possible without some violence.

If this is 'law', I would humbly say that in that case, in its best phase, goodness must remain only an individual virtue, incapable of forming associations and bringing the whole world together on its own strength. If so, its value to society must be regarded as only a limited one. Because in that case, so far as society was concerned, between Satan and God, Satan would have to be regarded the elder brother, exploiting God for his own purpose and generally paying Him just enough for His 'bare maintenance'. Man's hope to see the Kingdom of God established on earth must remain a mere day-dream.

But I do not believe that this is the law of the world. Even if it were the verdict of history till now, and were to remain so for generations to come, I do not take it as a final verdict, but only as a record of incomplete human effort. At best it meant that man has not yet had a clear realization of the necessary relation between, in the language of Aldous Huxley, 'ends and means'. He still persists in believing that bad means can attain good ends. The belief is akin to the superstitious belief of the ignorant villager, who persists in believing that the evil of an epidemic like cholera could be put an end to by sacrificing a goat before a goddess. That will go on so long as the superstition, however foolish or unfounded, persists. Man has tried and will try to end war and establish peace, justice, equality and prosperity by a programme of more wars, establishment of military, commercial and other similar types of empires and mandates, and doing horrible things in the name of law and order. Because man does not yet clearly see the necessary correspondence between good means and good ends, he has taken the easier course of perfecting the technique of might rather than the technique of good. This has taken place not only in government, but in other spheres also.

Did we not arrange till the other day (and perhaps do so even now) our educational systems on the principle of 'spare the rod and spoil the child'? Celebrated educationists thought that punishment was a better instrument of improving the intelligence and character of the child than love and perseverance and the creation of a helpful environment. So also, we teach religion by a system of penalties by the priests here or a threat of severe punishments by God in the world there. And if religion itself, founded by devotees of goodness, becomes tainted with the belief in the efficacy of Might, what wonder that other human affairs are organized on the same principle?

I have no doubt that votaries of goodness (or let me now return to Gandhiji's synonym for it, namely, nonviolence) are responsible if it works only spasmodically, individually, inefficiently and negatively. Somehow, nonviolence has often been debased by indolence; or rather indolence has often been mistaken for nonviolence. And since indolence must love individualism, nonviolence has often been considered an individual, unorganizable virtue, likely to be vitiated by organizational methods. Therefore, attempts to be actively good and to join together in doing and perfecting good have been feeble. Where there have been such attempts (*e.g.* by Christian Missions) they have rendered valuable service to society, until the time they have compromised with might, or the forces of violence.

Christianity put forth a programme of nonviolence in action. Gandhiji has modified and enlarged it in its particular application to India. He calls it 'the Constructive Programme'. The aim is to create proper conditions for the urge for Goodness, inherent in man, to grow and gather strength to effectively check the forces of violence and to put on the right track man's age-long endeavour to eradicate poverty, ignorance, filth, disease, narrow-mindedness, inequality, and open or concealed slavery, which make this earth a living hell.

Atheists would have had no quarrel with believers, if the latter had declared God's existence only in Heaven and not on earth. And believers would not have anything to say to the atheists, if the latter agreed that the urge for goodness is inherent in man and is a more valuable gift than the urge for might, and that it alone is the ultimate stay of mankind. I would request philosophers and theologians of all persuasions that instead of eternally discussing the question of the existence and nature of God, all should agree to so organize and evolve goodness that it should rule supreme on earth. When this is accomplished, there will be no question of faith or want

of faith. God, as an abbreviation and personification of goodness, will be felt as present on earth and His will executed on earth as it is supposed to be in heaven.

The spirit of satyāgraha, both in its resistance to violence and its propagation of goodness, is the revival in an intense form of the old light which comes as pointer and reminder to man, every time he forgets his goal either in his pursuit of might or slumber of indolence. And, suitably changing a great poet's language, I would say:

Should its light fade by distance and its remembrance vanish from man's memory, then it will come again. And with a richer light and stimuli more yielding to the spirit will it impress and urge.

Yea, the spirit of satyāgraha will return repeatedly every time man loses himself in might or indolence.

And though death may hide the satyāgrahī and the greater silence enfold him, yet again will the spirit of satyāgraha seek man's understanding. And not in vain will it seek. If aught that spirit has achieved is good, that good will reveal itself in a clearer voice and in forms more akin to man's urge for goodness.

This is my conception of living faith in goodness or nonviolence.

18 January 1945

K.G. MASHRUWALA

1. These observations appeared as an introduction in the first edition of this book.

APPENDIX 2

SATYAGRAHA BY THE PATHANS

The North-West Frontier Province on the mountainous north-west border of India formed part of India before the partition in 1947. It is now a province of Pakistan. The bulk of the population consists of Pathans. They are Muslims by religion and speak the Pushto language in common with the people in the adjoining tribal territory and Afghanistan. The language is also called Pakhtu and he who speaks it is a Pakhtun. The land inhabited by the people speaking Pushto or Pakhtuns is called as Pakhtunistan.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan (born 1890) the leader of the Pathans, especially of the Frontier Province, has the distinction of being called 'Frontier Gandhi'. This is on account of his unstinted adherence to the principles of truth and nonviolence in his fight against the British. He came to believe in these principles both for the uplift and progress of his own people and later for throwing off the yoke of foreigners. Even after the formation of Pakistan, he has continued to believe that autonomy alone is the key to the real regeneration and unification of all the Pakhtuns. Though persecuted and harassed, first by the British and now by the Pakistan Government—he has spent in all about thirty years in jail—his faith in truth and nonviolence remains unshaken. In spite of age and indifferent health, though now an exile in Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, a free neighbouring country, Abdul Ghaffar Khan cherishes the fond hope of full autonomy for Pathans through nonviolent means.

This leader of the Pathans who to them is 'Badshah Khan' brushed aside all opportunities for a career in life and dedicated himself early to the service of his people through education and social reform. The British rulers sensed danger in this ardent and patriotic servant of the people because keeping the Pathans away from modern education was their policy. Repression started by first threatening his father Behram Khan (95) and then throwing both father and son into prison for a length of time on the plea that Abdul Ghaffar was 'rebellious'.

The tireless reformer was however undaunted and in 1926 founded the Pakhtun Jirga, a kind of youth league. By that time he was al-

ready in rapport with the Gandhi-led Indian struggle (1919-1947) for freedom and since 1919 he had gone through all ordeals and suffering. In 1929 Badshah Khan formed a volunteer organisation in his province and called it 'Khudai Khidmatgar', the servants of God. It was meant to serve a single non-political purpose, namely, to bring about unity, solidarity and full cooperation among the Pathans through their service. It was later forced to fight the British non-violently. In 1929 Ghaffar Khan attended the Lahore Congress which declared complete Independence to be the goal of the Indian people. The government of his province began to harass him and his people. He asked for help from the Muslim League but was refused. He could not subscribe to the division of India religion-wise which the League aimed at. He therefore had to cast his lot irrevocably with the Congress and became a life-long adherent to the Gandhian technique.

Before I take up the trials and tribulations of the nonviolent Pathan army of Khudai Khidmatgars, let me say a few words about the type of people who could throw up such a fine disciplined army of nonviolent soldiers several thousands in number and about their beloved leader who still has an undimmed vision of the goal and an undiminished faith in the means of truth and nonviolence.

The following lines from *Frontier Speaks* (pp. 3-4) by Muhammad Yunus, speak for themselves :

The Pathans are frank, outspoken and open-hearted, and observe no distinction of rank. They are seldom rude, and treat age with great respect. It is difficult to intimidate them with modern devices. The people are hard and active; the nature of their country makes them excellent mountaineers. They are industrious and hard-working and lack the refinement and subtlety of their neighbours in India on the one side and Iran on the other. They despise ease and luxury. Writing in his book, *Kingdom of Cabul*, Elphinstone describes their character as follows: 'Their vices are revenge, envy, avarice, rapacity and obstinacy; on the other hand, they are fond of liberty, faithful to their friends, kind to their dependents, hospitable, brave, hardy, frugal, laborious and prudent; and they are less disposed than the nations in their neighbourhood to falsehood, intrigue and deceit. . . . I know no people in Asia who have fewer vices, or are less voluptuous or debauched.' The famous Turkish writer and patriot, Halide Edib, once described them as follows: 'They are sane in body and in

mind; they are honest in action and in thought; they have commonsense which only can create a workable society and just balance between material and spiritual forces; they have physical courage of a high kind, but what is more valuable, they have brave minds which do not shrink from facing realities.'

The people are very cheerful, humorous and witty and always appreciate a joke, even if it be at their own expense. They like fair-play; and any fancied or real instance of partiality or injustice incenses them. They are very proud of their descent.

It is equally interesting and important to see what the leader of the Pathans says (*Abdul Ghaffar Khan* by D. G. Tendulkar, p. 59) about them. He says:

Among us prevailed family feuds, intrigues, enmities, evil customs, quarrels and riots. Whatever the Pakhtuns earned was squandered on harmful customs and practices and on litigations. Underfed and under-clothed, Pakhtuns led a miserable life. Nor were we prosperous traders or good agriculturists. After prolonged exchange of views, in September 1929, we succeeded in forming the 'Khudai Khidmatgar' organisation. We called it so, in order to fulfil a particular purpose; we wanted to infuse among the Pakhtuns the spirit and consciousness for the service of our community and country in the name of God. We were wanting in that spirit. The Pakhtuns believed in violence and that too not against aliens but their own brethren. The near and dear ones were the victims of violence. The intrigues and dissensions tore them asunder. Another great drawback was the spirit of vengeance and lack of character and good habits among them.

Reforming the community was the main aim of Badshah Khan in organising the Khudai Khidmatgars. He says:

To remove the other social drawbacks from our backward community, we founded the organization 'Khudai Khidmatgar', the 'Servants of God'. At first it was a completely non-political organization, but the British policy of oppression compelled it to participate in politics. It is a paradox that the British were instrumental in bringing us and the Congress together.

I am a Khudai Khidmatgar, and as God needs no service I shall serve Him by serving His creatures selflessly. I shall never use violence, I shall not retaliate or take revenge, and I shall forgive any one who indulges in oppression and excesses against me. I shall not be a party to any intrigue, family feuds and enmity, and

I shall treat every Pakhtun as my brother and comrade. I shall give up evil customs and practices. I shall lead a simple life, do good and refrain from wrong-doing. I shall develop good character and cultivate good habits. I shall not lead an idle life. I shall expect no reward for my services. I shall be fearless and be prepared for any sacrifice.

Added to this is the song which in essence says: 'We are the army of God and we march ready to die without killing or illwill, for the cause of freedom. We love the people and serve humanity in the name of God and we shall remain nonviolent under the worst provocation.'

The Volunteers came to be also called 'Red Shirts' because their uniforms which were first dyed in brick-red were afterwards dyed full red for uniformity. This gave opportunity to mischievous elements and to the governments to link the Red Shirts with Communism from which they were miles away. Women volunteers wore black.

After this brief description of the people and the type of volunteers required for their reform, it is now necessary to describe the leader, Badshah Khan who organised the Khudai Khidmatgars and through them roused a whole people to fight against British slavery and endure repression of the cruellest kind.

I can do no better than quote Jawaharlal Nehru. In his Foreword to *Frontier Speaks* on page viii he says:

When the history of the present day comes to be written only very few of those who occupy public attention now will perhaps find mention in it. But among those very few there will be the outstanding and commanding figure of Badshah Khan. Straight and simple, faithful and true, with a finely chiselled face that compels attention, and a character built up in the fire of long suffering and painful ordeal, full of the hardness of the man of faith believing in his mission, and yet soft with the gentleness of one who loves his kind exceedingly. Watch him among his own people as they gather round him and look up to him with affection and admiration. He speaks to them in his well-loved Pushto, and though he may chide them often enough for their failings, his voice is soft and gentle and full of tenderness. Watch him again with little children, with his eyes sparkling as he plays with them and his hard face resolving into frequent laughter.

Jawaharlal further writes on page x as follows:

I have written about Abdul Ghaffar Khan. There is nothing so

surprising about our Frontier Province as the conversion of a warlike people to the doctrine of nonviolence. That conversion is, of course, far from complete and the Pathan does not worry himself about philosophical or metaphysical speculations. But it is patent that in action he has been remarkably nonviolent. The man who loved his gun better than his child or brother, who valued life cheaply and cared nought for death, who avenged the slightest insult with the thrust of a dagger, has suddenly become the bravest and most enduring of India's nonviolent soldiers. That was due undoubtedly to the influence of one man—Abdul Ghaffar Khan—whose word was almost law to his people, for they loved him and trusted him. The remarkable thing is that Badshah Khan, typical Pathan that he is, should have taken to nonviolence so earnestly and so thoroughly. He influenced thereby not only his own province but other parts of India also.

The two extracts above not only characterise Badshah Khan but also express Jawaharlal Nehru's surprise, appreciation and admiration for the conversion of the warlike and violent Pathan to the technique of heroic nonviolent resistance.

It remains now to give a few examples of the brave way the non-violent resister endured untold sufferings and insults and contributed substantially to the winning of independence for India. Both India and that part of India, namely, Pakistan, which parted company, owe not a little to Badshah Khan and his unarmed army of Khudai Khidmatgars in this behalf. That Badshah Khan has to continue his fight for complete autonomy within Pakistan for his own people is a matter which cannot but pain and agonise every freedom fighter. But that fact cannot and should not cloud, confuse or minimise the rich contribution made by the Khudai Khidmatgars to the cause of satyāgraha.

When Badshah Khan flung away all opportunities of a successful career for himself and started life as an educationist and social reformer, it is significant that an English Officer asked him, 'You go about educating these Pathans, but what security do you give that they wont revolt against us after they have been educated or organised by you?' When such was the atmosphere full of suspicion between the rulers and the ruled, a clash was inevitable.

It was in 1929 that a regular attempt was made and thousands of Khudai Khidmatgars were recruited in Charsadda, Mardan and other places. As the Pathans had a military background it was easy to

inculcate strict discipline among them. They were soon called upon to participate in the national movement for Indian independence. It took the form of the Salt Satyāgraha and Civil Disobedience which Gandhi started in April 1930.

It is not intended here to give the political history of the period nor the changes which took place in the governance of the N.W.F.P. Two nonviolent resistance movements in India which are historic and which paved the way for the coming of independence are those of 1930-32 and 1942-45. I shall describe here in brief the role which the Pathans and especially the Khudai Khidmatgars of the Frontier Province played as nonviolent soldiers during those two movements.

Badshah Khan plunged into the movement of 1930 with his innumerable Khudai Khidmatgars. He faced great hardships while he saw his followers exposed to the worst sufferings. Here I quote somewhat extensively from *Frontier Speaks*, Second Edition (pp. 117-120):

... An account of those days will furnish the future historian with the basis for an estimate of those who ruled our land in this twentieth century. Among many extraordinary and unfortunate occurrences was that of April 23, 1930, when hundreds of peaceful demonstrators were done to death by the military in the streets of Peshawar. It was on that day also that a Garhwali Regiment covered themselves with glory by refusing to fire on their peaceful and unarmed countrymen. That day, known as Martyrs' Day, has since been solemnly celebrated year after year all over the province.

Next day, April 24, 1930, Ghaffar Khan was arrested and his workers were rounded up, one and all. He was tried under the scandalous Frontier Crimes Regulation Act at Risalpur, an insignificant cantonment on the Frontier. This was done in order to avoid public attention. He was then taken away from the theatre of coming operations and confined in the Gujerat Central Jail. His journal, the *Pakhtoon*, was declared illegal, and its publication stopped. This was followed by the memorable trial of his gallant comrades.

The two years that followed formed an astounding period of darkness for the province as a whole. Shootings, beatings and other acts of grave provocation were perpetrated against these people, who had never suffered before without avenging themselves. 'Gunning the Red Shirts was a popular sport and pas-

time of the British forces in the province,' observed an American tourist, and he has not exaggerated, for the fate of our people was very much worse than that. The memory of what Mr Jameson did in the subdivision of Charsadda is still fresh in our minds. This Assistant Superintendent of Police used to strip and beat the Khudai Khidmatgars, and later, on their refusal to yield or to abuse their beloved hero, have them thrown into the dirty ponds near by. . . .

Government officers used to make our men run through cordons of solidiers, who kicked and prodded them with their rifles and bayonets. The gruesome incidents of Peshawar, where Mr Ice-Monger, the then Inspector-General of Police, kicked little children lying injured in the Qissa Khwani Street and prevented Dr Khan Sahib from rendering first-aid to people injured by bullets, have received some publicity through the Patel Report. At Kohat, in the bitter cold of the winter, our men were beaten up and later thrown into the icy stream running through the city. It was the same story at Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan, where the Khudai Khidmatgars were subjected to all manner of hardships. . . .

The residents of Masho Khel and Sheikh Mohamadi in Peshawar district will allways recall their sufferings when they watch the British Army of Occupation celebrate New Year's Day, because it was on that day in 1931 that their villages were raided by troops who made life hell for them. There are also the villagers of Takkar in Mardan district, who watched the murder of their beloved comrades on the 28th of May, 1930. The residents of Swabi have seen their fields destroyed, their wheat stocks ruined by oil poured upon them. Our men were thrown down from house-tops in Utmanzai, and their dwellings set on fire. The office of the Khudai Khidmatgars was burnt down and its charred remnants still stand in their glory in the bazar of Utmanzai. Once while these stories were being discussed in an Army mess at Peshawar, an English captain, who had seen the firing at Peshawar and at a few other places on the Frontier remarked: 'The whole show was an awful butchery'.

Then we come to the 1942 Quit India movement. Gandhi gave the call in spite of the fact that the Japanese were at the eastern frontier of India. He believed that only a free India could meet the challenge of a Japanese invasion. But the response of Whitehall was to let loose an avalanche of terror-striking repression. Gandhi des-

cribed it as 'leonine violence' in his letter to the Government from the Aga Khan Palace where he was imprisoned. In India, near civil insurrection conditions prevailed for some time in August 1942. Here is what happened in the Frontier Province (*Frontier Speaks*, 2nd Edition, pp. 181-86):

In the Frontier, we launched our movement with a general strike throughout the province. On the 10 of August, 1942, we held public meetings, and took out huge processions, and pledged our full support to the Quit India resolution of the Congress. There were strikes in schools and peaceful demonstrations before Government offices. Our programme included the picketing of liquor shops in the first instance, and later on refusal to recognize any foreign authority or its laws. We carried out all these instructions of our leader in a peaceful manner. The Frontier Government, unlike those other provinces, did not start any offensive against us openly, but employed numerous underhand tricks to obstruct our work. This used to cause us pain and irritation, and most of us were puzzled by Government's policy. Badshah Khan however, had no doubts, and he used to warn us that worse trials were in store for us. He would tell us that the Government's inactivity was temporary. They merely wanted to demonstrate to the world that Muslims had no stake in the struggle going on in the country. They knew that news of our participation in the movement, and of its suppression in a totally Muslim province, would falsify their own propaganda outside. . . .

Nonviolent resistance can gather strength only under repression. The Government did not resort to this in the beginning. They thought that they would be able to demoralize the people by ignoring the movement. Instead of repressive measures they employed various dirty tricks to confuse us. They hired a number of mullahs (priests) to dance to their tune. These hirelings went about preaching and exciting false religious sentiments. This 'department' was organized by a few degraded Indian officers, who were all very intimate with the then Governor. The Government further arranged to get printed thousands of posters containing all manner of filthy matter against us over faked signatures. These were distributed lavishly in the villages and the tribal territory. All press telegrams carrying our news were stopped altogether and, instead, the Government arranged to send news of their own fabrication to the papers. . . .

Towards the end of September, 1942, Badshah Khan unfolded the final item of his plan. Large batches of Khudai Khidmatgars were to *raid* Government buildings, and thus assume control of the administration. This was a great step forward, and the logical culmination of all that we had been doing in the past two months. It was not going to be like the usual picketing of shops selling foreign goods or liquor that the Congress had carried on in the past. It was intended to be a peaceful means of taking over the Government of this province.

Khudai Khidmatgars in their different districts collected in powerful batches, and the first raids took place all over the province on the 4th of October. It was a sight to see hundreds of red-robed volunteers marching from their camps towards their appointed destinations, shouting slogans of freedom and revolution, and carrying their national flag to be hoisted on Government buildings. All courts and offices in the Frontier were strongly guarded by the military and the police. As our men tried to break through those cordons, they were lathi-charged mercilessly, and many were knocked down unconscious. The following day, the police used tear gas to frighten the raiders, but everywhere this proved ineffectual in deterring them from reaching posts. They even mastered the method of minimizing the effects, and at places, hurled the tear gas bullets back at the police! The previous day's incidents had infused new life into our men, and they stood up fearlessly to the force employed against them. It was proved once again that the Pathan cannot brook any show of force, and that the slightest display of might rouses him to action. It was this fear that had kept our 'friendly Government' in restraint. Most of the Red shirts were seriously injured, and were taken away to relief centres run by the Congress. Those who did not sustain injuries were carried away in police vans to distant places, where they were abandoned, to walk back home. In Peshawar, the City Magistrate outdid the baton-wielders by running his car over the Khudai Khidmatgars. In this way he peeled off their skins and left them bleeding on the roadside. The rising tempo of the movement compelled the Government to close down the courts for a fortnight. It was not possible for them to function. During these two days and the period that followed, the Frontier Government shed its last vesture of hypocritical restraint. Their plan to isolate the Mussalmans from the 1942

Revolution had been foiled. The earnest resolve of the Pathans to achieve freedom alongside their countrymen in other parts of India threw the local 'bosses' into a fit of frenzy, and they hurriedly devised plans to meet the 'menace'.

On the second day of our raid, some adventurous folk indulged in looting, and laid hands on two post offices at Peshawar. Some policemen were also assaulted. Badshah Khan got news of this and at once appeared on the scene. He pleaded with the people to stop all such acts, for they would only discredit the peaceful resisters. His timely intervention cooled the rising fever of such friends. . . .

The movement continued with unabated vigour in spite of the mass arrests. Nearly six thousand workers had been rounded up before this policy was abandoned. In order to terrorize the peasantry, the authorities started confiscating their licensed arms, and auctioning their crops. . . .

Our jails were full, and most of the barracks occupied by us were terribly overcrowded. This naturally led to great inconvenience. The indifference of the Government and the negligence of the local staff made life impossible. In the beginning interviews with friends and relations were not allowed, and there were no definite regulations regarding the writing and receiving of letters. We could not get any newspaper either. There was no medical relief, and hundreds of our comrades lay ill and unattended in their crowded barracks. We had no facilities for a recreation of any type. Our food hardly deserved that name; before it could reach the mouths of the unfortunate prisoners, it had been substantially reduced both in quality and quantity. Let alone others, the treatment meted out to Abdul Ghaffar Khan was neither decent nor human. Having broken his ribs at the time of his arrest, Government kept him in jail without providing any medical aid. This resulted in a prolonged illness, from which he did not recover during his two and a half years' imprisonment.

In the meanwhile, in 1945 political events led to a change of ministry in the Frontier Province and the Congress Ministry which took over released all political prisoners on 16 March 1945.

It was in August 1947 that India became free but it was a divided India. Pakistan though a wholly Muslim government did not take kindly to Badshah Khan and his followers. The trials and tribulations of the Khudai Khidmatgars and their leader did not end with

the dawn of freedom in Pakistan. The brutal massacre of men and women going for prayer to a mosque in Babra, Charsadda district, on 12 August 1948 is sufficient to show what ordeals they had to face. Badshah Khan had already been thrown into prison and many were offering satyāgraha. A description of what happened on that day may best be given in the words of Badshah Khan himself:

About a month and a half after our arrest, while Dr Khan Sahib was still at large, Khudai Khidmatgars were to assemble at Charsadda for the jumma namāz. They were to offer prayers for their comrades who had been imprisoned and demand their release. The mosque where they were to assemble was situated on an elevation. They were proceeding there in an orderly procession, led by an old man. The women were bearing the Koran copies on their heads. Abdul Qaiyum had his troops posted in the mosque. When the procession approached the foot of the elevation, machine-gun fire was opened on them. Under the shower of bullets, the Koran copies were reduced to tatters and blown off the women's heads. Their commander ordered the Khudai Khidmatgars to lie down on the ground. Their bodies were riddled by machine-gun fire as they lay prone. Those who survived were assaulted, while they were performing namāz. (*Abdul Ghaffar Khan* by D.G. Tendulkar, p. 466).

The crime of the heroes was they demanded autonomy for Pathans within the framework of Pakistan. The leader was thrown into prison often and after long suffering was allowed to go to England for treatment. From there he has gone to Kabul and is a guest of the Afghan Government today. His faith in nonviolence has kept him hopeful and busy, trying to secure autonomy for his own people. He is now 78. Faith indeed is a life-long battle.

The latest (12-12-1966) and well-deserved tribute to him is by Dr Zakir Husain, President of India. In his Foreword to *Thrown to the Wolves* by Pyarelal, Dr Husain says: 'An exponent of the philosophy of nonviolence that Mahatma Gandhi presented to us, he adopted and clothed it in action on a scale unequalled by any living man today'.

I may close this story with a few words of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan which embody his faith in truth and nonviolence. He wrote in 1942: '... To me nonviolence has come to represent a panacea for all the evils that surround my people, and therefore I am devoting all my energies towards the establishment of a society that should

be based on its principles of truth and peace' (*Frontier Speaks* 2nd Edition, p. xiii).

APPENDIX 3

SATYĀGRAHA AND THE NEGROES

On the afternoon of December 1, 1955, a weary Negro woman refused to give up her seat on a bus to a white passenger in the southern city of Montgomery, Alabama. She was arrested and taken to jail.

By her refusal, Mrs Rosa Parks was defying a long-standing custom of separating the white and Negro races—a custom reinforced by local and state laws. Her action marked the beginning of the nonviolent protest movement by Negroes in the United States.

The decision to use mass nonviolent action to dramatise Negro grievances grew out of a meeting in Montgomery, headed by two young clergymen, the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr and Reverend Ralph D. Abernathy, who organised a boycott against the bus company.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Supreme Court also established a new legal climate in race relations in the United States with its 1954 unanimous decision against segregation in the U.S. public schools.

The court also ruled against segregation in interstate travel, allowing all people to move between states in trains, buses and planes without regard to race or colour. The court extended this ruling to cover hotels, restaurants, places of recreation and amusement.

What emerged from the court as a ruling in education has also been extended to other areas, including restrictive covenants, voting and inter racial marriage.

The effect of the Montgomery movement quickly spread to other areas of the south. As a result, the U.S. Congress soon enacted some of the most significant social legislations affecting Negroes and other minority groups ever passed in the United States.

Although a few campaigns against bus segregation and other obstacles to civil rights had occurred in other areas, it was the Montgomery bus boycott, with its surprising endurance and massive dimensions that rallied Negro leaders throughout the south. Negroes in other cities began to experiment with nonviolence as a means of securing their rights.

Like many other Negro movements, the Montgomery boycott was organised under church auspices. The idea of the nonviolent programme was born at a meeting in the Mount Zion Church on

December 5, when leaders organised what was then the Montgomery Improvement Association. Dr Martin Luther King, then only 26 years old, was elected President of the Association. Rev. Abernathy was named director of its programme. The Organisation later became the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia.

The Montgomery boycott lasted 381 days. Almost the entire Negro population of the city, more than 50,000 walked to their jobs, or organised car pools and used other transportation in an effort to bring an end to segregation. The bus company went bankrupt and when another one was organised, it announced that it would operate on a non-segregated basis.

Following the success in Montgomery, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference began to mobilise the churches to strengthen the civil rights movement. Participants included both Negroes and whites.

By 1958 working groups on nonviolence had been formed in all major cities in ten southern states. These groups involved themselves in voter registration campaigns, organised rallies in 22 southern cities and instructed Negroes throughout the south in the techniques of community leadership.

One widely used tactic of Dr King's followers was the 'sit-in'. These began in Greensboro, North Carolina, in 1960. In defiance of local laws forbidding Negroes to be served in restaurants patronised by whites, Negro students occupied seats at lunch counters and refused orders to leave. The movement attracted both white and Negro students who found in it a mutual interest to move for social changes.

The success of the nonviolent protest movement in Montgomery, which led to the end of legal segregation on bus transportation in the south, inspired the Birmingham movement of 1963. Directed primarily at public accommodations, this was the largest mass effort by Negroes alone against segregation in the south. They met stubborn resistance and more than 3,000 were arrested. However, the effort helped arouse the conscience of the American people to the need for more civil rights legislation.

These nonviolent protests served to speed school integration and voter registration in the south. One drive alone in Atlanta added more than 5,000 new Negro names to the voting rolls.

The spirit of the nonviolent movement gained momentum and

spread to university campuses throughout the country. In 1960, young participants were influential in organising the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee at Shaw University, in Raleigh, North Carolina. Aided by northern volunteers, southern students initiated 'sit-in' movements that spread to more than 150 southern towns and cities by the end of the year. Hundreds were jailed as they tried to desegregate shops, restaurants, bathing beaches and other public facilities.

The year 1961 saw the beginning of the freedom rides, when hundreds of students—Negro and white—journeyed by bus through the south, demanding equal treatment on the nation's transportation systems.

President Kennedy responded to the Negro movement for equality by asking Congress to pass new legislation.

Negro leaders, however, were not convinced that their needs would be met. They initiated another series of demonstrations and boycotts, both in the north and the south. The biggest demonstration was the August 28, 1963, 'March on Washington'. More than 200,000 people, Negro and white, assembled peacefully in the national capital to voice their demand for equality in education, employment, housing and voting.

Upon President Kennedy's death late that year, Mr Johnson gave first priority to civil rights, and the result was the Civil Rights Act of 1964, forbidding racial discrimination in many aspects of life.

Next year, Congress passed a voting rights Act which, together with the 1964 law, gave the Negro greater assurance of justice than any legislation passed in the preceding 100 years had given.

In the summer of 1966, the movement of nonviolence moved out of the south into the north, where programme against poverty in the urban ghettos were initiated. Open housing marches were initiated in the white neighbourhoods of Chicago in an attempt to obtain in that city a comprehensive open housing plan. Groups met stubborn resistance. Finally, an agreement was reached between the marchers and the so-called white power structure to ease the restrictions on housing.

On April 11, 1968, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law a memorable Civil Rights Bill that bans racial barriers in about 80 per cent of the housing in the United States.

The U.S. Congress had completed action on this major gain for Civil Rights only a few days after the tragic slaying of the Reverend

Dr Martin Luther King Jr on April 4.

The Civil Rights Act of 1968, prohibits discrimination immediately in federally-owned housing, and in multi-unit dwellings insured with federal funds. Broader prohibitions in the Bill will go into effect progressively. By January 1, 1970, private single-unit home sales or rentals not involving a broker will be the only major category of housing not covered under the new law. The ban on racial barriers in housing will extend to 56.2 million living units.

Another major provision of the Bill provides federal protection to Americans exercising their Civil Rights and the Civil Rights workers attempting to assist those persons. The provision also assures the right to serve as a Juror in a Federal Court without discrimination.

A third major provision extends broad Civil Rights to American Indians, long a neglected minority group.

The civil rights legislation is a significant addition to the series of major laws passed by the Congress to give Negro Americans and other American minorities legal protection against many forms of discrimination.

The Americans recognize that the new 'Open Housing' law alone will not solve the problems of poor housing, unemployment, low wages and inadequate education in the city centres where many Negro Americans are clustered.

Nor will the law, by itself, resolve racial antagonisms and fears. This legislation is an important step, however, toward the solution of a part of a combination of problems. It is a step, under law, that reaffirms the nonviolent principles of Dr Martin Luther King.¹

1. From a pamphlet issued by the firm of Indian Oxygen.

APPENDIX 4

DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR

Dr Martin Luther King was born on January 15, 1929. He was named Michael Luther King. The prophetic name of Martin Luther was given to him at the age of 6, about the time when his father also changed his name.

Although King personally experienced none of the economic deprivation of his race, he suffered the emotional deprivation of segregation at the age of 6, when two white boys with whom he had made friends were forbidden to play with him. At his all-Negro School, the Young Street Grade School, he learnt all about the hardships of a closed society.

Significantly it was in 1950 just after 2 years of the death of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi that Martin Luther King (Jr) heard a lecture on Gandhi, by Mordecai Johnson, President of Howard University, a predominantly Negro institution in Washington D.C. 'His message was so profound and electrifying that I left the meeting and bought half a dozen books on Gandhi's life', Dr King wrote some years later.

Regarding the Montgomery bus system Dr King was called upon to serve as leader of the boycott. He hesitated at first, held back by the thought that to inflict economic damage on the Bus Company was perhaps un-Christian and unethical.

He concluded, however, that since the system of segregated seating on buses—white passengers in front and Negroes in the rear—was evil in itself resisting the system without force was certainly justified.

Dr King was behind the bars sixteen times in his attempts to gain equal rights for Negroes.

The Federal Court gave judgement that bus segregation violated the section of the U.S. Constitution giving equal protection of the laws. The Supreme Court in Washington affirmed the judgement, thereby overruling the old decision that permitted segregated seating.

Dr King insisted that 'our aim must never be to defeat or humiliate the white man, but to win his friendships and understand-

ing'.

When reacting to the bomb thrown at Luther's home, Dr King on the spur of the moment said to the big crowd which had gathered, 'We cannot solve this problem through retaliatory violence, we must meet violence with nonviolence'. Immediately the crowd dispersed quietly.

In India

Fulfilling a lifelong dream to visit the country of Gandhi, King made a trip to India in early 1959. Writing about his experience in India King said, ' . . . My privilege of travelling to India had a great impact on me personally, for it was invigorating to see firsthand the amazing results of a nonviolent struggle to achieve independence. The aftermath of hatred and bitterness that usually follows a violent campaign was found nowhere in India, and a mutual friendship based on complete equality, existed between the Indian and the British people within the Commonwealth.'

March on Washington

On August 28, 1963, in the largest civil rights demonstration in the history of United States about 200,000 people including 60,000 whites took part in the March on Washington mainly on behalf of the Civil Rights Bills pending in the Congress. Dr King in his speech echoed the Bible, the Constitution and the National Anthem to assure the multitude of pilgrims that the prophecy of equality and freedom for Negroes would all come true.

The 35 year old Pastor was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1964. Mr Gunnar John, Chairman of the Committee that selected the civil rights leader in the name of the Parliament of Norway, said, 'Dr King is the first person in the western world to have shown us that a struggle can be waged without violence.'

Shortly before his death Dr King said, 'I may not get there with you, but I want you to know tonight that we as a people will get to the promised land.' These words have certainly a prophetic ring.

A selection of extracts from Dr King's speeches and writings follows:

On Death

We all think about death and every now and then I think about my own death and I think about my own funeral Tell him who

will deliver the eulogy, not to mention that I have a Nobel Peace Prize.

I would like somebody to say that day that Martin Luther King (Jr) tried to give his life serving others.

I would like him to say that day that Martin Luther King (Jr) tried to love somebody.

I would like him to say on that day that I did try in my life to visit those who were in prison, and I want him to say that I tried to love and serve humanity.

The Negro's Dream

There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights.

We should not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must for ever conduct our struggle upon the highest plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence

Even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up, live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal' I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the colour of their skin, but by the content of their character.

Man Has a Right to Survive

This evening I would like to use this lofty and historic platform to discuss what appears to me to be the most pressing problem confronting mankind today. Modern man has brought this whole world to an awe-inspiring threshold of the future. He has reached new and astonishing peaks of scientific success. He has produced machines that think and instruments that peer unfathomable ranges of interstellar space. He has built gigantic bridges to span the seas and gargantuan buildings to kiss the skies. His airplanes and space ships have dwarfed distance, placed time in chains and carved highways through the stratosphere. This is a dazzling picture of modern man's scientific and technological progress.

Yet, in spite of these spectacular strides in science and technology, and still unlimited ones to come, something basic is missing. There

is a sort of poverty of the spirit which stands in glaring contrast to our scientific and technological abundance. The richer we have become materially, the poorer we have become morally and spiritually. We have learned to fly the air like birds and swim the sea like fish, but we have not learned the simple art of living together as brothers.

This problem of spiritual and moral lag, which constitutes modern man's chief dilemma, expresses itself in three larger problems which grow out of man's ethical infantilism. Each of these problems, while appearing to be separate and isolated, is inextricably bound to the other. I refer to racial injustice, poverty and war.

The first problem that I would like to mention is racial injustice. The struggle to eliminate the evil of racial injustice constitutes one of the major struggles of our time. The present upsurge of the Negro people of the United States grows out of a deep and passionate determination to make freedom and equality a reality here and now

The deep rumbling of discontent that we hear today is the thunder of disinherited masses, rising from dungeons of oppression to the bright hills of freedom, in one majestic chorus the rising masses singing, in the words of our freedom song, 'Ain't Gonna Let Nobody Turn Us Around'. All over the world, like a fever, the freedom movement is spreading in the widest liberation in history. The great masses of people are determined to end the exploitation of their races and land. They are awake and moving toward their goal like a tidal wave. You can hear them rumbling in every village, street, on the docks, in the houses, among the students, in the churches and at political meetings.

Historic movement was for several centuries that of the nations and societies of Western Europe out into the rest of the world in conquest of various sorts. That period, the era of colonialism, is at an end. East is meeting West. The earth is being redistributed. Yes, we are shifting our basic outlooks.

These developments should not surprise any student of history. Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The yearning for freedom eventually manifests itself. The Bible tells the thrilling story of how Moses stood in Pharaoh's court centuries ago and cried, 'Let my people go'. This is a kind of opening chapter in a continuing story.

The present struggle in the United States is a later chapter in the

same unfolding story. . . .

In the United States we have witnessed the gradual demise of the system of racial segregation. . . .

Let me not leave you with a false impression. The problem is far from solved. We still have a long, long way to go before the dream of freedom is a reality for the Negro in the United States. . . .

What the main sections of the civil rights movement in the United States are saying is that the demand for dignity, equality, jobs and citizenship will not be abandoned or diluted or postponed. If that means resistance and conflict we shall not flinch. We shall not be cowed. We are no longer afraid.

The word that symbolizes the spirit and the outward form of our encounter is nonviolence, and it is doubtless that factor which made it seem appropriate to award a Peace Prize to one identified with the struggle. Broadly speaking, nonviolence in the civil rights struggle has meant not relying on arms and weapons of struggle. It has meant non-cooperation with customs and laws which are institutional aspects of a regime of discrimination and enslavement. It has meant direct participation of masses in protest, rather than reliance on indirect methods which frequently do not involve masses in action at all.

Nonviolence has also meant that my people in the agonizing struggles of recent years have taken suffering upon themselves instead of inflicting it on others. It has meant, as I said, that we are no longer afraid and cowed. But in some substantial degree it has meant that we do not want to instil fear in others or into society of which we are a part. The movement does not seek to liberate Negroes at the expense of the humiliation and enslavement of whites. It seeks no victory over anyone. It seeks to liberate American society and to share in the self-liberation of all the people.

Violence as a way of achieving racial justice is both impractical and immoral. . . .

This approach to the problem of racial injustice is not at all without successful precedent. It was used in a magnificent way by Mohandas K. Gandhi to challenge the might of the British Empire, and free his people from the political domination and economic exploitation inflicted upon them for centuries. He struggled only with the weapons of truth, soul force, non-injury and courage.

In the past 10 years unarmed gallant men and women of the United States have given living testimony to the moral power and

efficacy of nonviolence. . . .

A second evil which plagues the modern world is that of poverty. Like a monstrous octopus, it projects its nagging, prehensile tentacles in lands and villages all over the world. Almost two-thirds of the people of the world go to bed hungry at night. They are undernourished, ill-housed and shabbily clad. Many of them have no houses or beds to sleep in. Their only beds are the sidewalks of the cities and the dusty roads of the villages. Most of these poverty-stricken children of God have never seen a physician or a dentist. This problem of poverty is not only seen in the class division between the highly developed industrial nations and the so-called underdeveloped nations: it is seen in the great economic gaps within the rich nations themselves.

Take my own country for example. We have developed the greatest system of production that history has ever known. We have become the richest nation in the world. Our gross national product this year will reach the astounding figure of almost 650 billion dollars. Yet, at least one-fifth of our fellow-citizens—some 10 million families, comprising about 40 million individuals—are bound to a miserable culture of poverty.

There is nothing new about poverty. What is new, however, is that we have the resources to get rid of it. More than a century and a half ago people began to be disturbed about the twin problems of population and production. A thoughtful Englishman named Malthus wrote a book that set forth some rather frightening conclusions. He predicted that the human family was gradually moving toward global starvation, because the world was producing people faster than it was producing food and material to support them. Later scientists, however, disproved the conclusion of Malthus, and revealed that he had vastly underestimated the resources of the world and the resourcefulness of man.

There is no deficit in the human resources; the deficit is in human will.

The time has come for an all-out world war against poverty. The rich nations must use their vast resources of wealth to develop the underdeveloped, school the unschooled and feed the unfed.

The wealthy nations must go all out to bridge the gulf between the rich minority and the majority.

In the final analysis, the rich must not ignore the poor because both rich and poor are tied in a single garment of destiny. . . .

A third great evil confronting our world is that of war. Recent events have vividly reminded us that nations are not reducing but rather increasing their arsenals of weapons of mass destruction. The best brains in the highly developed nations of the world are devoted to military technology.

If we assume that life is worth living and that man has a right to survive, then we must find an alternative to war. In a day when vehicles hurtle through outer space and guided ballistic missiles carve highways of death through the stratosphere, no nation can claim victory in war. A so-called limited war will leave little more than a calamitous legacy of human suffering, political turmoil and spiritual disillusionment. A world-war—God forbid—will lead inexorably to ultimate death. So if modern man continues to flirt unhesitatingly with war, he will transform his earthly habitat into an inferno such as even the mind of Dante could not imagine.

Therefore, I venture to suggest to all of you and all who hear and may eventually read these words, that the philosophy and strategy of nonviolence become immediately a subject for study and for serious experimentation in every field of human conflict, by no means excluding the relations between nations. It is, after all, nation-states which make war, which have produced the weapons which threaten the survival of mankind, and which are both genocidal and suicidal in character. . . .

We will not build a peaceful world by following a negative path. It is not enough to say we must not wage war: it is necessary to love peace and sacrifice for it. We must concentrate not merely on the negative expulsion of war, but on the positive affirmation of peace.

Pilgrimage to Nonviolence

Since the philosophy of nonviolence played such a positive role in the Montgomery Movement, it may be wise to turn to a brief discussion of some basic aspects of this philosophy.

First, it must be emphasized that nonviolent resistance is not a method for cowards; it does resist. If one uses this method because he is afraid or merely because he lacks the instruments of violence, he is not truly nonviolent. This is why Gandhi often said that if cowardice is the only alternative to violence, it is better to fight. He made this statement conscious of the fact that there is always another alternative: no individual or group need submit to any wrong, nor need they use violence to right the wrong; there is the way of nonviolent

resistance. This is ultimately the way of the strong man. It is not a method of stagnant passivity. The phrase 'passive resistance' often gives the false impression that this is a sort of 'do-nothing method' in which the resister quietly and passively accepts evil. But nothing is further from the truth. For while the nonviolent resister is passive in the sense that he is not physically aggressive toward his opponent, his mind and emotions are always active, constantly seeking to persuade his opponent that he is wrong. The method is passive physically, but strongly active spiritually. It is not passive non-resistance to evil, it is active nonviolent resistance to evil.

A second basic fact that characterizes nonviolence is that it does not seek to defeat or humiliate the opponent, but to win his friendship and understanding. The nonviolent resister must often express his protest through non-cooperation or boycotts, but he realizes that these are not ends themselves; they are merely means to awaken a sense of moral shame in the opponent. The end is redemption and reconciliation. The aftermath of nonviolence is the creation of the beloved community, while the aftermath of violence is tragic bitterness.

A third characteristic of this method is that the attack is directed against forces of evil rather than against persons who happen to be doing the evil. It is evil that the nonviolent resister seeks to defeat, not the persons victimized by evil. If he is opposing racial injustice, the nonviolent resister has the vision to see that the basic tension is not between races. As I like to say to the people in Montgomery: 'The tension in this city is not between white people and Negro people. The tension is, at bottom, between justice and injustice, between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. And if there is a victory, it will be a victory not merely for fifty thousand Negroes, but a victory for justice and the forces of light. We are out to defeat injustice and not white persons who may be unjust.'

A fourth point that characterizes nonviolent resistance is a willingness to accept suffering without retaliation, to accept blows from the opponent without striking back. 'Rivers of blood may have to flow before we gain our freedom, but it must be our blood,' Gandhi said to his countrymen. The nonviolent resister is willing to accept violence if necessary, but never to inflict it. He does not seek to dodge jail. If going to jail is necessary, he enters it 'as a bridegroom enters the bride's chamber'.

One may well ask: 'What is the nonviolent resister's justification for this mass political application of the ancient doctrine of turning

the other cheek?' The answer is found in the realization that unearned suffering is redemptive. Suffering, the nonviolent resister realizes, has tremendous educational and transforming possibilities. 'Things of fundamental importance to people are not secured by reason alone, but have to be purchased with their suffering,' said Gandhi. He continues: 'Suffering is infinitely more powerful than the law of the jungle for converting the opponent and opening his ears which are otherwise shut to the voice of reason.'

A fifth point concerning nonviolent resistance is that it avoids not only external physical violence but also internal violence of spirit. The nonviolent resister not only refuses to shoot his opponent but he also refuses to hate him. At the centre of nonviolence stands the principle of love. The nonviolent resister would contend that in the struggle for human dignity, the oppressed people of the world must not succumb to the temptation of becoming bitter or indulging in hate campaigns. To retaliate in kind would do nothing but intensify the existence of hate in the universe. Along the way of life, someone must have sense enough and morality enough to cut off the chain of hate. This can only be done by projecting the ethic of love to the centre of our lives.

In speaking of love at this point, we are not referring to some sentimental or affectionate emotion. It would be nonsense to urge men to love their oppressors in an affectionate sense. Love in this connection means understanding, redemptive goodwill. Here the Greek language comes our aid. There are three words for love in the Greek New Testament. First, there is 'eros'. In Platonic philosophy 'eros' meant the yearning of the soul for the realm of the divine. It has come to now to mean a sort of aesthetic or romantic love. Second, there is 'philia' which means intimate affection between personal friends. 'Philia' denotes a sort of reciprocal love; the person loves because he is loved. When we speak of loving those who oppose us, we refer to neither 'eros' nor 'philia'; we speak of a love which is expressed in the Greek word 'agape'. 'Agape' means understanding, redeeming goodwill for all men. It is an overflowing love which is purely spontaneous, unmotivated, groundless, and creative. It is not set in motion by any quality or function of its object. It is the love of God operating in the human heart. . . .

A sixth basic fact about nonviolent resistance is that it is based on the conviction that the universe is on the side of justice. Consequently, the believer in nonviolence has deep faith in the future.

This faith is another reason why the nonviolent resister can accept suffering without retaliation. For he knows that in his struggle for justice he has cosmic companionship. It is true that there are devout believers in nonviolence who find it difficult to believe in a personal God. But even these persons believe in the existence of some creative force that works for universal wholeness. Whether we call it an unconscious process, or impersonal Brahman, or a Personal Being of matchless power and infinite love, there is a creative force in this universe that works to bring the disconnected aspects of reality into a harmonious whole.

APPENDIX 5

VOWS OF SATYĀGRAHA ĀŚRAM (SABARMATI)

Gandhi founded the Āśram in 1915 near Ahmedabad on the bank of the Sābarmati. The object of the 'home' was stated to be 'to learn how to serve the motherland and serve it'. The rules and disciplines of the Āśram were calculated to help those who adopt satyāgraha as a way of life.

In what follows I first condense the vows, mostly keeping Gandhi's original words. Then there are some observations. I am not giving the rules as such.

The vows fall into two categories—principal and subsidiary.

Principal Vows

1. Truth: It is not enough that one ordinarily does not resort to untruth. One ought to know that no deception may be practised even for the good of the country, that truth may require opposition to one's parents and elders. Consider the example of Prahlāda.

2. Ahimsā (non-injury): It is not enough not to take the life of any living being. The follower of this vow may not hurt physically or mentally even those whom he believes to be unjust; he may not be angry with them, he must love them; thus he would oppose the tyranny and injustice, whether of parents, governments or others, but will never hurt the tyrant. The follower of truth and ahimsā will conquer the tyrant by love; he will not carry the tyrant's will but he will suffer punishment even unto death for disobeying his will until the tyrant himself is conquered.

3. Celibacy: It is well-nigh impossible to observe the foregoing two vows unless celibacy is also observed; for this vow, it is not enough that one does not look upon any woman with a lustful eye; he has to control his animal passions so that they will not move him even in thought; if he is married, he will not have a carnal mind regarding his wife but will consider her as his life-long friend and will establish with her the relationship of perfect purity.

4. The Palate: Until one has overcome the temptations of the palate, it is difficult to observe the foregoing vows, more especially that of celibacy. Control of the palate is therefore treated as a

separate observance. One desirous of serving the country will believe that eating is necessary only for sustaining the body. He will, therefore, daily regulate and purify his diet and will either gradually or immediately, in accordance with his ability, eschew such food as may tend to excite or stimulate animal passions or are otherwise unnecessary.

5. Non-stealing: It is not enough not to steal what is commonly considered as another man's property. It is theft if we use articles which we do not really need. Nature provides from day to day just enough and no more for our daily needs.

6. Non-possession: It is not enough not to possess and keep much, but it is necessary not to keep anything which may not be absolutely necessary for our bodily wants; thus if one can do without chairs, one should do so. The follower of this vow will, therefore, by constant reflection simplify his life.

Subsidiary Vows

7. Svadeśī: It is inconsistent with truth to use articles about which or about whose makers there is a possibility of deception. Therefore, for instance, a votary of truth will not use articles manufactured in the mills of Manchester, Germany, or even in his own country, for he does not know that there is no deception about them. Moreover, labourers suffer much in the mills. Use of fire in the mills causes enormous destruction of life besides killing labourers before their time. Foreign goods and goods made by means of complicated machinery are, therefore, taboo for a votary of ahimsā. Further reflection will show that use of such goods will involve breach of the vows of non-stealing and non-possession. We wear foreign cloth in preference to simple goods made by our own countrymen on our own handlooms because custom attributes greater beauty to them. Artificial beautifying of the body is a hindrance to a brahmacārī; he will, therefore, avoid the use of any but the simplest goods. Therefore, the vow of svadeśī requires the use of simple and simply made clothing to the exclusion of even fancy buttons, foreign cuts, etc., and so will svadeśī be applied to every department of life.

8. Fearlessness: He who is affected by fear can hardly follow truth or ahimsā. Inmates of the Āśram will, therefore, endeavour to be free from the fear of kings, people, caste, families, thieves, robbers, ferocious animals such as tigers and even death. A truly fearless man will defend himself against others by truth-force or soul-

force.

Then follow some important observations.

Language: No nation can make real progress by abandoning its own languages; inmates will, therefore, train themselves through the medium of their respective tongues, and as they desire to be on terms of intimacy with their brethren from all parts of India, they will also learn the chief Indian language—Hindustani.

Hand Labour: Physical labour is a duty imposed by nature upon mankind. We may, therefore, resort to bodily labour alone for our sustenance, and use our mental and spiritual powers only for the common good, and as the largest percentage lives upon agriculture, inmates will devote some part of their time to working on the land; and when such is not possible, perform some other bodily labour.

Handlooms: One of the chief causes of poverty in the land is the virtual disappearance of cotton spinning-wheels and handlooms. They will, therefore, make a great effort to revive this industry by working upon handlooms themselves.

Politics: Politics, economic progress, etc. are not considered to be independent branches of learning but they are all rooted in religion. As effort will, therefore, be made to learn politics, economics, social reform, etc. in a religious spirit, and work in connection with these matters will be taken up by the inmates with energy and devotion.

Vinoba Bhave, a prominent inmate of the Āśram at that time, has versified the vows in Marathi. They are as follows: *ahimsā*, truth, non-stealing, celibacy, non-possession, manual labour, control of palate or non-taste, fearlessness, equality of religions, *svadeśī*, and removal of untouchability.

RULES FOR A SATYĀGRAHĪ

In 1930, before starting on the Dandi march, Gandhi drew up rules for the conduct of satyāgrahīs. Following are the preamble and rules which appeared in *Young India* on 27-2-1930 (At the end are 'qualifications' mentioned by Gandhi) :

Love does not burn others, it burns itself. Therefore a satyāgrahī, i.e., a civil-resister, will joyfully suffer unto death. It follows, therefore, that a civil resister, whilst he will strain every nerve to compass the end of the existing British rule, will do no intentional injury in thought, word or deed to the person of a single Englishman. This necessarily brief explanation of a satyāgrahī will perhaps enable the reader to understand and appreciate the following rules.

As an individual:

1. A satyāgrahī, i.e. a civil-resister, will harbour no anger.
2. He will suffer the anger of the opponent.
3. In so doing he will put up with assaults from the opponent, and never retaliate; but he will not submit out of fear of punishment or the like to any order given in anger.
4. When any person in authority seeks to arrest a civil-resister, he will voluntarily submit to the arrest. He will not resist the attachment or removal of his own property, if any, when it is sought to be confiscated by the authorities.
5. If a civil resister has any property in his possession as a trustee, he will refuse to surrender it, even though in defending it he might lose his life. He will, however, never retaliate.
6. Non-retaliation includes swearing and cursing.
7. Therefore, a civil resister will never insult his opponent and therefore also not take part in any of the newly-coined cries or slogans which are contrary to the spirit of ahimsā.
8. A civil-resister will not salute the Union Jack, nor will he insult it or officials, English or Indian.
9. In the course of the struggle if any one insults an official, or commits an assault upon him, a civil resister will protect such

official or officials from the insult or attack even at the risk of his life.

As a Prisoner:

10. A civil-resister will behave courteously towards prison officials, and will observe all such disciplines, of the prison as are not contrary to self-respect; as, for instance, whilst he will salute officials in the usual manner, he will not perform any humiliating gyrations and he will refuse to shout 'Victory to Sarkār' or the like. He will take cleanly cooked and cleanly served food which is not contrary to his religion, and will refuse to take food insultingly served or served in unclean vessels.

11. A civil-resister will make no distinction between an ordinary prisoner and himself, will in no way regard himself superior to the rest, nor will he ask for any convenience that may not be necessary for keeping his body in good health and condition. He is entitled to ask for such conveniences as may be required for his physical or spiritual well-being.

12. A civil-resister may not fast for want of conveniences whose lack does not involve any injury to his self-respect.

As a Unit;

13. A civil-resister will joyfully obey all the orders issued by the leader of the corps, whether they please him or not.

14. He will carry out the orders in the first instance even though they appear to him insulting, inimical, or foolish, and then appeal to higher authority. He is free before joining, to determine the fitness of the corps to satisfy him, but after he has joined it, it becomes a duty to submit to its discipline, irksome or otherwise. If the sum-total of the activities of the corps appears to a member to be improper or immoral he has a right to sever his connection, but being within it, he has no right to commit a breach of its discipline.

15. No civil-resister is to expect maintenance for his dependents. It would be an accident if any such provision is made. A civil-resister entrusts his dependents to the care of God. Even in ordinary warfare wherein hundreds and thousands give themselves up to it they are able to make no previous provision. How much more, then, should such be the case in satyāgraha! It is the universal experience that in such times hardly anybody is left to

starve.

In Communal Fights

16. No civil-resister will intentionally become a cause of communal quarrels.

17. In the event of any such outbreak, he will not take sides, but he will assist only that party which is demonstrably in the right. Being a Hindu he will be generous towards Mussalmans and others, and will sacrifice himself in the attempt to save non-Hindus from a Hindu attack. And if the attack is from the other side, he will not participate in any retaliation but will give his life in protecting Hindus.

18. He will, to the best of his ability, avoid every occasion that may give rise to communal quarrels.

19. If there is a procession of satyāgrahīs they will do nothing that would wound the religious susceptibilities of any community, and they will not take part in any other processions that are likely to wound such susceptibilities.

The following are the qualifications I hold as essential for a satyāgrahī in India :—

1. He must have a living faith in God for He is his only rock.
2. He must believe in truth and nonviolence as his creed and therefore have faith in the inherent goodness of human nature which he expects to evoke by his truth and love expressed through his suffering.
3. He must be leading a chaste life and be ready and willing for the sake of his cause to give up his life and his possessions.
4. He must be a habitual khādī-wearer and spinner. This is essential for India.
5. He must be a teetotaller and be free from the use of other intoxicants in order that his reason may be always unclouded and his mind steady.
6. He must carry out with a willing heart all the rules of discipline as may be laid down from time to time.
7. He should carry out the jail rules unless they are specially devised to hurt his self-respect.

These qualifications are not to be regarded as exhaustive. They are illustrative only. (Gandhi in *Harijan*, 25-3-1939).

APPENDIX 7

SOME PLEDGES

Following are some of the most important pledges taken by satyāgrahīs on different occasions.

A. Kaira Satyāgraha (No-tax) 1918: Peasants' Pledge

'Knowing that the crops of our villages are less than four annas (25 per cent), we had requested the Government to suspend the revenue collection till the ensuing year. As however, Government has not acceded to our prayer, we, the undersigned, hereby solemnly declare that we shall not pay the full or remaining revenue but we will let the Government take such legal steps as they may think fit to collect the same and we shall gladly suffer all the consequences of our refusal to pay. We shall allow our lands to be confiscated, but we shall not, of our own accord, pay anything and thereby lose our self-respect and prove ourselves wrong. If Government decide to suspend the second instalment of the revenue throughout the district, those amongst us who are in a position to pay, will pay the whole or the balance of the revenue as may be due. The reason why those of us who have the money to pay still do not, is that if we do, the poorer might in panic sell their things or borrow to pay and thereby suffer. In the circumstances, we believe it is the duty of those who are able to pay to protect the poor.'

NOTE: Similar was the pledge taken during the no-tax campaign of Bardoli in 1928.

B. Satyāgraha in 1919 (Breach of Law): Satyāgraha Pledge

'Being conscientiously of opinion that the bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. 1 of 1919, and Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill No. 2 of 1919, are unjust, subversive of individual liberty and justice, and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these Bills becoming Law, until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a committee to be hereafter appointed may think improper and further affirm that in this struggle

we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property.'

C. Volunteer's Pledge (Ahmedabad Congress, December 1921)

'With God as witness I solemnly declare that,

1. I wish to be a member of the National Volunteer Corps.
2. So long as I remain a member of the Corps, I shall remain nonviolent in word and deed and shall earnestly endeavour to be nonviolent in intent since I believe that, as India is circumstanced, nonviolence alone can help the Khilafat and the Punjab and result in the attainment of Svarāj and consolidation of unity among all the races and communities of India, whether Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Parsee, Christian or Jew.
3. I believe in, and shall endeavour always to promote such unity.
4. I believe in Svadeśhī as essential for India's economic, political and moral salvation, and shall use handspun and handwoven khaddar to the exclusion of every other cloth.
5. As a Hindu, I believe in the justice and necessity of removing the evil of untouchability and shall on all possible occasion seek personal contact with, and endeavour to render service to, the submerged classes.
6. I shall carry out the instructions of my superior officers and all the regulations not inconsistent with the spirit of this pledge prescribed by the Volunteer Board or the Working Committee or any other agency established by the Congress.
7. I am prepared to suffer imprisonment, assault or even death for the sake of my religion and my country without resentment.
8. In the event of my imprisonment, I shall not claim from the Congress any support for my family or dependents.

NOTE : Individual Satyāgraha (1940-1941) pledge was similar, with the clause about compulsory spinning added to it.

D. The Khudai Khidmatgar's Pledge (The Servant of God in Frontier Province)

In the presence of God I solemnly affirm that:

1. I hereby honestly and sincerely offer myself for enrolment as a Khudai Khidmatgar.
2. I shall be ever ready to sacrifice personal comfort, property, and even life itself to serve the nation and for the attainment of

my country's freedom.

3. I shall not participate in factions, nor pick up a quarrel with or bear enmity towards anybody. I shall always protect the oppressed against the tyranny of the oppressor.

4. I shall not become a member of any other organization, and shall not furnish security or tender apology in the course of the nonviolent fight.

5. I shall always obey every legitimate order of my superior officers.

6. I shall always live up to the principle of nonviolence.

7. I shall serve all humanity equally. The chief objects of my life shall be attainment of complete independence and religious freedom.

8. I shall always observe truth and purity in all my actions.

9. I shall expect no remuneration for my services.

10. All my services shall be dedicated to God; they shall not be for attaining rank or for show.

APPENDIX 8

THE CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME

The importance of the constructive programme from the point of view of satyāgraha is so great that Gandhi, in his booklet *Constructive Programme* says: 'Civil disobedience is not absolutely necessary to win freedom through purely nonviolent efforts, if the cooperation of the whole nation is secured in the constructive programme.

. . . My handling of Civil disobedience without the constructive programme will be like a paralysed hand attempting to lift a spoon'.

Following are the items of the fifteen-fold constructive programme given to the country by Gandhi. Many more were added and in fact every programme which goes to help man in his peaceful progress, physical, mental, moral and spiritual is really constructive.

Those enumerated by Gandhi are:

1. Communal unity—unity among the various castes and communities of India.
2. Removal of untouchability.
3. Prohibition of drinks and drugs.
4. Khadi; spread of handspun and handwoven cloth of all kinds of natural fibres.
5. Other village industries.
6. Village sanitation, health and hygiene.
7. Basic education—education through craft.
8. Adult education and literacy.
9. Uplift of women.
10. Uplift of the whole village (samagra grāmasevā).
11. Spread of Hindustani (lingua franca of India).
12. Love of the mother tongue.
13. Work for economic equality.
14. Service of the aborigines.
15. Organization of students, kisāns, and labourers.

GLOSSARY

A.I.C.C.: All India Congress Committee, the deliberative standing committee of the Congress elected annually by its delegates.

Annewari: Valuation of standing crops by the Revenue Department in terms of annas in a rupee. An anna is one-sixteenth of a rupee.

Āśram: Originally a hermitage. It usually means a home where workers devoted to social, religious or political service live together and observe a particular discipline.

Avarṇa: One who is beyond the pale of the four varṇas or main divisions (brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, vaiśya and sūdra) among the Hindus. An untouchable or a pariah.

Begār: A kind of impressed labour; it may be of various types.

Brāhmin: (brāhmaṇa) One belonging to the first of the four varṇas among the Hindus. The priests usually belong to this varṇa.

Caste-dinner: Dinner given to all the caste people on certain specified occasions.

C.D.: Civil Disobedience.

Camār: A shoe-maker.

Carkhā: A spinning wheel.

Cowkidāri: A small tax levied in Bihar and other provinces and supposed to be spent for policing.

C.I.D.: Criminal Investigation Department.

Communal Award: Award given by Mr Ramsay Macdonald, when Premier in 1932, as regards the political rights of major communities in India.

Congress: The Indian National Congress, the premier and the most powerful political organization in India. It is in existence for the last eighty three years. Its aim was Complete Independence and its methods were peaceful and legitimate, i.e. nonviolent and truthful.

Congress High Command: Working Committee of the Congress.

Congress Working Committee: The Executive of the Congress consisting now of about twenty-one members.

Cr. Pro. Code: Criminal Procedure Code.

Cutcherry: Office.

Dakṣiṇa: Fees due to priests.

Dinabandhu: The friend or brother of those who deserve compassion.

A title given to Mr C.F. Andrews by Indians.

Dharmayuddha: Fight for truth.

Darbār: Court held by a King or by his officers on his behalf.

Golden Temple: Biggest temple of the Sikhs at Amritsar.

Guru: The spiritual teacher.

Grantha Sāhib: The Bible of the Sikhs.

Gurudyāra: The temple of the Sikhs.

Harījans: Literally 'men of God'. Name given to the untouchables of India by Gandhi.

Havildār: A police officer superior to a constable. Usually warders in jails are miscalled Havildārs.

Hinduism: Hindu religion; that system of culture which is predominant in India and is professed by 85 per cent of its people.

Hindustani: The lingua franca of India.

Īśāvāsyopaniṣad: One of the ten important Upaniṣads.

Kālī: Goddess worshipped mainly by Bengali Hindus. Incarnation of Pārvatī, the consort of śiva.

Kālāpānī: Literally 'black water'. Penal servitude for life in the Andaman Islands. (It is now abolished.)

Kāśī: Benares, now called vārānasī, the sacred city of the Hindus.

Khaddar, Khādī: Handspun and hand-woven cloth.

Khilāfat: The Khalif is the spiritual head (like the Pope) of the Mussalmans. Khilāfat is that office which pertains to the khalif.

Kisān: Indian peasant.

Mahant: High priest of a temple or monastery.

Mahār: One of the sections of untouchables.

Pañcāyat: Comes from *Pañca* meaning five. Any elected body or committee to conduct public affairs, judicial or otherwise.

Patel or Pātil: Village officer.

Prāṇa prātiṣṭhā: Establishing or introducing 'life' into an idol. This is a religious ceremony without which no Hindu idol becomes worthy of formal worship.

Rāj: Kingdom.

Rāmanavamī: The ninth day in Caitra, the first month of the Hindu year. This is supposed to be the birthday of the great hero Rāma.

Rta: Action according to truth, right moral action.

Sādhanā: Spiritual discipline; any course of discipline.

Salām: Salutation, wishing, especially the Mohammadan way of doing it.

Sāhib: A European is usually called thus in India.

Sardār: Knight.

Sat-śri-akāl: The triple attribute of God according to the Sikhs: the True, the Powerful and the Timeless.

Seva dal: A volunteer corps. *Sevā* means service. *Dal* is a corps.

Sowars: Police on horse-back.

Svadeśī: Belonging to one's own country.

Svarāj: Self-rule.

Tahsīl: A small revenue division consisting of about a lakh of population.

Tālūk: A revenue division of about the same size as a Tahsīl.

Talāti: The village clerk.

Tulsi plant: A plant sacred to the Hindus.

Thānā; The police or revenue office.

Vidyā, avidyā: Knowledge of the eternal verities/and knowledge of the material world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Horace Alexander. *Resisting Evil without Arms* (London, Friends' Peace Committee, 1959).

C.F. Andrews. *Akali Struggle*.

A. Appadorai. *Use of Force in International Relations* (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1958).

Sri Aurobindo. *The Doctrine of Passive Resistance* (Calcutta, Arya Publishing House, 1948).

R.G. Bell. *Alternative to War* (London, James Clarke, 1959).

Joan V. Bondurant. *Conquest of Violence: Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1958).

N.K. Bose. *Satya and Ahimsa: Mahatma Gandhi's Interpretation* (Calcutta, Committee for World Pacifist Meeting, 1949).

Nirmal Kumar Bose. *Studies in Gandhism* (Calcutta, the Author, 1962).

George W. Briggs. *The Power of Nonviolence in India* (Madison, N.J., 1943).

Fenner Brockway. *Non-cooperation in Other Lands*.

Clarence Marsh Case. *Nonviolent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1923).

Correspondence with Mr Gandhi (Government of India Publication).

Arun Chandra Dasgupta. *Nonviolence: the Invincible Power* (Calcutta, Khadi Pratishthan, 1946).

Bart De Ligt. *The Conquest of Violence: an Essay on War and Revolution* (London, Routledge, 1937).

Mahadev Desai. *A Righteous Struggle. The Ahmedabad Textile Labourer's Fight (1917)* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1951).

Mahadev Dasai. *The Story of Bardoli, being a History of the Bardoli Satyagraha of 1928 and Its Sequence* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1929).

Narayan Desai. *A Handbook for Shanti Sainiks* (Varanasi, Sarva Seva Sangh, 1963).

R.R. Diwakar. *Satyagraha in Action: A Brief Outline of Gandhiji's Satyagraha Campaigns* (Calcutta, Signet Press, 1959).

R.R. Diwakar. *Satyagraha: The Pathway to Peace* (Patna, Pustak Bhandar, 1950).

Joseph J. Doke. *M.K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa* (London, London Indian Chronicle, 1909).

Ted Dunn. *Alternatives to War and Violence—A Search* (London, James Clarke, 1963).

Verrier Elwin. *A Philosophy of Love* (Delhi, Publications Division, 1962).

A. Ruth Fry. *Victories without Violence* (London, Dennis Dobson 1939).

M.K. Gandhi. *Constructive Programme: Its Meaning and Place* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1945).

M.K. Gandhi. *Hind Swaraj* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1939).

M.K. Gandhi. *For Pacifists* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1949).

M.K. Gandhi. *The Law of Love* (Bombay, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1957).

M.K. Gandhi. *My Nonviolence* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1960).

M.K. Gandhi. *Nonviolence in Peace and War* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1948).

M.K. Gandhi. *Satyagraha in His Own Words, 1910-1935* (Allahabad, All India Congress Committee, 1935).

M.K. Gandhi. *Satyagraha in South Africa* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1928).

M.K. Gandhi. *Satyagraha: Nonviolent Resistance* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1951).

M.K. Gandhi. *The Science of Satyagraha* (Bombay, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1957).

M.K. Gandhi. *The Story of My Experiments with Truth* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1948).

Atulya Ghosh. *Ahimsa and Gandhi* (Calcutta, Congress and Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1954).

Richard B. Gregg. *A Discipline for Nonviolence* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1941).

Richard B. Gregg. *Gandhi's Satyagraha or Nonviolent Resistance* (Madras, Ganesan, 1930).

Richard B. Gregg. *The Power of Nonviolence* (London, Routledge, 1935).

Richard B. Gregg. *The Psychology and Strategy of Gandhi's Non-violent Resistance* (Madras, Ganesan, 1929).

W.K. Hancock. *Four Studies of War and Peace in this Century* (Cambridge, University Press, 1961).

Harijan Files From the Beginning.

George Hendrick. *Thoreau and Gandhi: A Study of the Development of 'Civil Disobedience' and Satyagraha* (Thesis, Texas, 1954).

Guy Franklin Hershberger. *War, Peace and Non-resistance* (Scottsdale, Herald Press, 1953).

Guy Franklin Hershberger. *The Way of the Cross in Human Relations* (Scottsdale, Herald Press, 1958).

Cecil E. Hinshaw. *Nonviolent Resistance: A Nation's Way to Peace* (Pendle Hill Pamphlet, 1956).

Dorothy Hogg. *The Moral Challenge of Gandhi* (Allahabad, Kitab Mahal, 1946).

Aldous Huxley. *Ends and Means* (London, Chatto & Windus).

William James. *The Moral Equivalent of War*

Kailash Nath Katju. *Creed Vs. Policy of Nonviolence* (Allahabad, Law Journal Press, 1942).

Krishnadas. *Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi, being an Inside View of the Non-cooperation Movement, 1921-1922* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1951).

J.C. Kumarappa. *Stone Walls and Iron Bars* (Allahabad, New Literature, 1946).

T.C.K. Kurup. *Gospel of Gandhi* (Madras, Madras Review Office).

John Lewis. *The Case Against Pacifism* (London, Allen and Unwin).

A.D. Lindsay. *Pacifism as a Principle and Pacifism as a Dogma* (London, Student Christian Movement Press, 1939).

Mahatma Gandhi, the Man and His Mission (Madras, Natesan).

K.G. Mashruwala. *Practical Nonviolence and Ideology of Nonviolence* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1946).

M.S. Maurice. *The Ethics of Passive Resistance* (Madras, Ganesh & Co.).

William Robert Miller. *Nonviolence: A Christian Interpretation* (London, George Allen, 1964).

John Middleton Murry. *The Necessity of Pacifism* (London, Jonathan, 1937).

V.V. Ramana Murthi. *Nonviolence in Politics: A Study of Gandhian Techniques and Thinking* (Delhi, Frank Brothers, 1958).

Edgar W. Orr. *Christian Pacifism* (Essex, Daniel Co., 1958).

Jawaharlal Nehru. *An Autobiography* (London, Bodley Head, 1942).

Shankarlal Parikh. *Kheda Satyagraha* (in Gujarati).

N.B. Parulekar. *The Science of Soul-force or Mahatma Gandhi's*

Doctrine of Truth and Nonviolence (Bombay, Hind Kitabs, 1962).

A Perspective on Nonviolence (Philadelphia, Friends Peace Committee, 1957).

R.K. Prabhu and U.R. Rao. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi* (Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1946).

Pyarelal. *Gandhian Techniques in the Modern World* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1953).

S. Radhakrishnan. *Mahatma Gandhi, Essays and Reflections in his Life and Work* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1939).

Romain Rolland. *Mahatma Gandhi: The Man who Became one with the Universal Being* (London, Allen, 1924).

K. Santhanam. *Satyagraha and the State* (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1960).

Gene Sharp. *Gandhi Faces the Storm* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1961).

Gene Sharp. *The Meaning of Nonviolence* (London, Housman's Book Shop, 1957).

Gene Sharp. *Which Way to Freedom? A Study in Nonviolence* (Cardiff, Plaid Cymru).

Krishnalal Shridharani. *War Without Violence: A Study of Gandhi's Method and Its Accomplishments* (London, Gollancz, 1939).

Pattabhi Sitaramiah. *The History of the Indian National Congress* (Bombay, Padma Publications, 1946).

J. Allen Skinner. *Towards a Nonviolent Society: A Study of Some Social Implications of Pacifism* (London, George Allen, 1949).

Pitirim A. Sorokin; *The Way of Love and Power: Types, Factors and Techniques of Moral Transformation* (Boston, Beacon Press, 1954).

D.G. Tendulkar. *Gandhiji His Life and Work* (Bombay, Karnatak Publishing House, 1945).

Unto Tahtinen. *Nonviolence as an Ethical Principle, With Special Reference to the Views of Mahatma Gandhi* (Turku [Finland], 1964).

Leo Tolstoy. *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays* (London, Oxford University Press, 1951).

Ishwara Topa. *Ethos of Nonviolence* (Ahmedabad, Navjivan, 1964).

Vinoba. *Shanti Sena* (Varanasi, Sarva Seva Sangh, 1961).

Young India files from the beginning.

INDEX

- Abernathy, Ralph D. 211
 Afghanistan 199
 Aga Khan Palace (Poona) 206
 Ahimsā 15, 21, 25, 27, 32-7, 46,
 49, 107, 160, 162, 225, 227
 Ahmedabad 130
 Alexander, General 183
 Alexander, Horace 173
 Alexander (Mrs.) 117
 All India Home Rule League 163
All Quiet on the Western Front 68
 Aney, M.S. 175
 Andrews, C.F. 42-3, 79, 144
 Ankola 135
 Arjuna 47
 Ashbury, Justice 153
 Asiatic Law Amendment Act 119
 Asiatic Registration Act 13
 Asiatic Registration Bill 119
 Āśram (Sābarmatī) 129, 225
 Atomic bomb 74, 191
 Austria 151-2
 Axis 183
 Azad, Abul Kalam 183-4

 Bajaj, Jamnalal 145
 Ballou, Adim 86
 Bapat, Senapati 30
 Bardoli 58, 63, 93-5, 133-5, 165
 Begar 138
 Behram Khan 199
 Belgaum 136
Bhagavadgītā 3, 34, 47
 Bhatt, Shamal 3, 35
 Bhave, Vinoba 180-1, 227

 Birukov 155
 Bismarck 151
 Bitti 139-40
 Borsad 63
 Bose, Subhas Chandra 167
 Botha, General 63
 Brahmacharya 13
 Brailsford, H.L. 171
 Buddha 7, 8, 10, 80, 99
 Buddhism 34-5, 188

 Caddel 140
 Canada 155
 Cape Town 119
Case for India 81
 Champaran 23-4, 27, 66, 122-3,
 125-6, 157
 Charsadda 203, 205
 Chauri Chaura 133, 165
 Chelmsford, Lord 63
 Chertkov 155
 Chowkidāri tax 176, 177
 Churchill, Winston 183, 190
 Civil disobedience 53, 57, 62, 86,
 87, 91, 93, 103, 106, 123, 126-7,
 165, 180-1, 204, 234
 Civil Disobedience Committee
 (Congress) 166
 Civil disobedience, mass 165
 Civil Rights Act 213-4
 Clifford, Dr 28
 Collins 136, 137
 Congress—A.I.C.C. 59-60, 93,
 106, 133, 145-6, 161-5, 167, 179-
 82, 184-5, 190, 232

Congress Responsibility for Disturbances 55, 62

Conscientious objectors 180

Constantine 86

Constructive programme 27, 36, 54, 56, 77, 92-5, 126, 163, 165, 197

Cripps Proposals 183

Cripps, Sir Stafford 183

Criminal Procedure Code 124, 145

The Cross Moves East 79

Dandi march 106, 170, 228

Dante 221

Das, C.R. 164

Dawn of Freedom in India 42, 68

Deak, Francis 151-2

Desai, Mahadev 95

Deśatyāga 9

Devar Baba 142-3

Dhaminapada 34

Dharasana salt depot 98, 106, 171

Dharma 188, 195

Dharmaj 146

Dharma-yuddha 130

Dharnā 8, 9

Dharwar 135

Dhruva, Prof. 130

Diet (Hungarian) 151

A Discipline for Nonviolence 98

Diwakar, R.R. 186, 191, 194

Doke, Joseph J. 3, 9, 13, 58, 119

Dominion Status 168-9

Dukhobars 155

Duncan (Colonial Secretary) 120

Durāgraha 27, 30

Durant, Will 81

Durban 116-7

Dyer, General 42, 159, 161

East Africa 68

Edgecombe, Mount 121

Edib, Malide 200

Education Test Act 118

Einstein, Albert 84

Elphinstone, M. 200

Emerson, R.W. 86

Ends and Means 44, 84, 90

Estergalyes, Janos 154

Fast 56, 107

Ferring, Miss 130

Finland 150

Flag Day 145

Foch, Marshall 97

Fox, George 99

Francis of Assisi, St. 99

Freedom rides 213

Friend 88

Frontier Crimes Regulation Act 204

Frontier Gandhi: *see* Ghaffar Khan, Abdul

Frontier Speaks 200, 202, 204, 206, 210

Gandhi 42-3, 44, 49, 64, 77, 78, 83, 85-7, 179, 188, 195, 204, 215-6, 219, 223, 225, 228 and constructive activities 94, 95; and domestic satyāgraha 115-7; and passive resistance 28-9; and satyāgraha 2, 4, 10; and self-purification 24; and truth and nonviolence 21, 22, 24-7, 37, 72, 73-5, 80, 92; a practical idealist 36; as a karma-yogī 40; as satyāgrahī 12, 116; in South Africa 1, 3, 4, 23; on atom bomb 71; on civil disobedience 62, 234 on fasts 107-8; on God

- 36; on love and nonviolence 32-3, 113; on politics 39; on satyāgraha 63; on untouchability 94; on violence 60-1; on war 88
 Gandhian techniques 200
Gandhi: His Relevance for Our Times 23
 Gandhi-Irwin Pact 107, 135-6, 174
Gandhiji's Correspondence with the Government 192
 Gandhi, Maganlal 2
 Gangaram, Sir 145
 Garrison, William Lloyd 86
 Geneva Convention 64
 George, Lloyd 151
 Germany 150
 Germistone 27-8
 Ghaffar Khan, Abdul 72, 199-204, 206-9
 God 6, 21, 22, 99, 102, 105, 108, 187, 197
 Golden Temple (Amritsar) 143-4
 Gregg, Richard B. 84, 98-9, 150, 155
 Gujarat Central Jail 204
 Gujranwala 159
 Guntur 174
 Gwyer, Sir Maurice 193
- Hardikar, Dr 145
Harijan 59, 62, 92, 184, 186-7
 Harijans 175
 Hariścandra 2, 6-7, 35
 Hart, Liddell 98
 Hartāl 9, 56, 104, 158
 Heard, Gerald 84
 Heber, Bishop 9
 Heraclitus 86
 Hijrat 57
- Hinduism 34
 Hirekerur 135
 Hiroshima 71
 Hitler, Adolf 190
 Hoshen 3, 27-8
 Hoyland, John S. 79
 Hungary 151-4
 Hunter Committee 61, 161
 Hussain, Zakir 209
 Huxley, Aldous 38, 44, 70, 84, 90-1, 150-1, 197
- Ice-Monger 205
 Indian Criminal Law Amendment 157, 165
Indian Opinion 2, 71-2
 Indian Relief Bill 121
 Internationalists 69
 Irwin, Lord 136, 174
 Iyengar, Srinivasa 167
- Jainism 34-5, 188
 Jallianwalla Bagh 159, 161
 Jameson 205
 James, William 65
 Jayakar, M.R. 168, 172
 Jesus 7-8, 21, 80-2, 85-6, 99, 188
 Joad, C.E.M. 44, 84
 Johannesburg 28, 120
 John, Gunnar 216
 Johnson, Lyndon 213
 Johnson, Mordecai 215
 Joseph, Francis 152
- Kabul 199
 Kallenbach 121
 Kanara, North 135
 Kannada 155-6
 Kapur Singh 138-9
 Kasturba Gandhi 13, 116, 126

- Kasur 159
 Kautilya 86
 Kelappan 131
 Kennedy, J.F. 213
 Khan Saheb, Dr 205, 209
 Khādī (also khaddar) 94, 234
 Khilāfat 161-3, 179, 232
 Khudāi Khidmatgār 200-5, 207-9, 232
 Kichlew, Dr 159
Kingdom of Cabul 200
The Kingdom of God is Within You 3, 8
 King, Martin Luther (Jr) 83, 211-4, 215-7
 Koran 209
 Kotgiri 138-9
 Kripalani, J.B. 59
 Krishnaswami 131
 Kropotkin, Prince 86
 Kultur Kampf 151
 Kuper, Leo 73
- Lajpatrai, Lala 164
 Land Acquisition Act 141
 Lathi 172
 Linlithgow, Lord 191-2
 Lippman, Walter 66
 Love 2, 4, 12-3, 22, 32, 35-6, 38-41, 45, 47-52, 66, 74-5, 79-81, 114, 130, 146, 186-7, 223, 228
- MacDonald, Ramsay 172
 Machiavelli, Niccolo 86
 Macpherson 144
 Madhavan 131
Mahātmā Gandhi's Ideas 79
 Mahāvīra 7, 80
 Malthus 220
 Martyr's Day 177, 204
- Masho Khel 205
 Mavlas 140-1
 Miller, Webb 171
 Milne, A.A. 69
 Mir Alim 117
 Mitra, S.C. 172
 Montgomery (Alabama) 211
 Montgomery Bus Boycott 211-2, 221
 Moses 218
 Motihari 24, 124
 Munro, Sir Thomas 156
 Munshiganj 147
 Muslim League 200
My Experiments with Truth 72, 115-6, 128
- Nagpur Satyāgraha Committee 145
 Naidu, Sarojini 135, 171
 Napoleon Bonaparte 97
 Nasik temple 147
 Natal Congress 119
 Natal Law Society 118
 National Week 106, 162
 Nehru, Jawaharlal 167-8, 183-4, 202-3
 Nehru, Motilal 168
 Neil 132
 Nero 111
New Freeman 171
 New Testament 3, 223
 Nichols, Beverly 69
 Nippon 183
 Nirvāna 35
 Nobel Peace Prize 216-7, 219
 No-cart Movement 139
 Non-cooperation 56, 78, 91, 139, 151, 156, 161-5; nonviolent 166
 Non-resistance 85

Nonviolence 2, 3, 4, 12, 15-7,
21-3, 25-7, 33, 37, 43-4, 48-9,
53, 55, 63, 67, 69, 75, 78-82, 84,
87-8, 91-2, 111-2, 129, 139, 144,
163, 173, 175, 186-8, 196-8, 206,
209, 216, 219, 223-4, 229, 233

Nonviolent army 92; attitude 16;
defence 110; direct action 55, 59,
69; force 77; mass resistance 152;
method 15; movement 212; non-
cooperation 44; raids 57, 173;
resistance 3, 41, 55, 90-2, 150,
185, 203-4, 206, 221-3; resistance
in Kanara 155; resister 90, 224;
revolution 85; soldier 90, 98,
203

No-rent Campaign 177

No-tax Campaign 93-4, 133, 136
165, 173, 177

North West Frontier Province
199, 204

Nuclear tests 73; war 73; weapons
37

Pacifism 85, 87, 88

Pacifist 85

Pacifists 66, 85

Pakhtoon 204

Pakhtunistan 199

Pakhtun Jirga 199

Panchasheel 110

Panchāyat 138-9

Parks, Rosa 211

Pārvasi temple 147

Passive non-resistance 222

Passive resistance 1-4, 9-10, 13,
27-29, 59, 70-1, 119, 122

Passive Resistance in South Africa
73

Passive resisters 72, 122

Patel Report 205

Patel, Vallabhbhai, 94, 127, 133-4,
142, 170, 175, 193

Peace 70, 77, 83, 86, 110, 113-4,
196, 210, 221

Peaceful resistance 8

Peace movement 78

Peace Pledge Union 85

Peace worker 77

Pearl Harbour 183

Pecs 153-4

Phoenix Park 115, 121

Picketing 57, 78, 87, 95, 109

Pilate, Pontius 8

Planters' Association 124, 126

Polak, H.S.L. 121

Polybius 86

Poona Pact 175

Power of Nonviolence 84, 98-9,
155

Prahlāda 6, 10, 188, 225

Pretoria 116

Prince of Wales 165

Pyarelal 209

Qaiyum, Abdul 209

Qissa Kwani 205

Quakers 86

The Quiet Battle 10, 84

Quit India campaign 184, 205-6

Raichand 35

Rajagopalachari, C. 133

Rajendra Prasad 126, 175

Rajkot fast 108, 193

Red Cross 64

Red Shirts 202, 207

Rolland, Romain 41, 74, 84

Roosevelt, F.D. 190

Round Table Conference 61-2,

- 106, 173-4
Rowlatt Act 61, 157-8, 160-3
Ruskin, John 86
Russell, Bertrand 69
Russell, George 98
- Sādhana 89, 108
Sābarmatī Āśram 176
Salt Law 106, 169-71, 173
Sambamurti, Bulusu 167
Sanikatta salt depot 171
Sapru, Tej Bahadur 168, 172
Satya 1, 2, 21, 160, 162
Satyāgraha 158, 185, 187, 193, 198, 229 and democracy 109; and discipline 97-9; a new weapon 11; as soul force 29, 72; and social evolution 112-4; and strikes 10, 30; and war 65-70; as a political weapon 39-40; as a social weapon 4-5, 45, 46, 53, 59, 62, 90; as a way of life 48, 54, 73, 84, 89, 112, 225; as a weapon of love 16-7, 38, 47; classification of 56, 85; doctrine of 81; ethics of 189-91; future of 80, 83; Gandhian 27, 30-1, 84; mass 43, 58, 150, 160; origin of 1-2, 13-4; strategy of 29; śuddha 27, 29; technique of 101-7; weapon of the brave 79
Satyāgraha Committee 104
Satyāgraha Day 157-8
Satyāgraha in South Africa 14, 29
Satyāgrahas—Ahmedabad 128-30; Bardoli 133-5; Borsad 142; Champaran 122-6; Flag 145; Guru-ka-Bagh 98, 143; Individual 103, 105, 179-80, 232; Jail 147-9; Kheda 126-8, 157, 231; Madras 132-3; Mulshipetha 30, 140; (1932-34) 177-8; Rajkot 191; Rowlatt Act 103, 157-60, 161, 231; Salt 106, 169-73; South Africa 3-4, 12, 14, 27, 43, 58, 118-22; Vykom 130-2
Satyāgrahī 4, 12, 17-8, 20, 24, 27, 29, 31, 38-41, 44-6, 48-52, 60, 71, 78, 90, 96, 102, 181-2, 193-4; and moral force 41; and nonviolence 17, 27, 52; and self-suffering 31, 49, 55; and truth and nonviolence 18, 20, 101, 186; disciplines for 99-100, 228; State 109-12
Satyapal, Dr 159
Sen Gupta 170
Sermon on the Mount 3, 8
Sevāgrām 85
Sharp, Gene 73, 85
Shiroda 171
Sibley, Mulford Q. 10, 84
Siddapur 135
Simon Commission 167
Sikhs, Akali 143-5
Simla 138-9
Sirsi 135
Sit-in 212-3
Śiva 130, 147
Slocombe 171-2
Smuts, General 62, 66, 68, 117, 120, 122
Socrates 7, 9-10, 188
South Africa 1, 3, 4, 8, 12-4, 23, 61, 63, 66, 71, 115-22, 186
Southern Christian Leadership Conference 212
Stalin 190
Stokes, S.E. 138-9
The Story of Bardoli 95, 134

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee 213
 Suffragist movement 28
 Svadeshi 160, 226, 232
 Svarāj 24, 81, 84, 163, 168; pūrṇa 168-9
 Svarājist Party 167, 176
 Svarāj Sabhā 163

 Tata Power Company 140
 Tendulkar, D.G. 201, 209
 Textile Labour Union 130
 Thakore Saheb 193
 Thoreau, Henry David 8, 13
Thrown to the Wolves 209
 Tilak Svarāj Fund 164
 Tin Kanthia 123-5
 Tippu Sultan 156
To Every Briton 45, 73
 Tolstoy Farm 8
 Tolstoy, Leo 3, 8, 72, 80
 Trade Union Congress 153
 Transvaal 119, 121
 Transvaal Government Gazette 119
 Travancore 130-2; Maharaja of 132
 Tregubov 155
 Truth 1, 2, 4, 11, 17-27, 33, 36, 39, 43-4, 48-9, 51, 53, 61, 67, 72, 80-1, 88-9, 92, 94, 96, 99, 101-2, 105-7, 112-4, 186-8, 210, 219, 225-6, 230
 Turkey 161
 Tyabji, Abbas 171
 Tzu, Hsun 86

Unilateral disarmament 75
 United Nations Organisation 113
 Untouchables 130-1
 Untouchability 94, 175, 180, 234
 Upaniṣad 21, 34

 Vedas 1, 34
 Vedapalli 174
 Violence 5-10, 11, 15-7, 25-6, 36, 41-2, 49, 52-5, 60-1, 64-7, 69, 74-8, 83-4, 86-7, 90-1, 107, 112-4, 162, 185, 188, 196, 216, 219
 Viramgaon 159
 Viśvāmitra 6-7

 Wadala Salt Depot 171
 War 37, 39, 64-9, 71, 74-8, 83, 85-8, 91, 102, 110, 113-4, 186, 196, 220-1; abolition of 76; of Independence (1857) 132; Zulu 88
 Wardha 182
 Washington, march on 213
 Wehrmacht 183
What I Owe to Christ 42
 Willingdon, Lord 174
 Wilson, Sir Leslie 143
 Woolman, John 99
 World War I 88, 157, 162
 World War II 46, 69, 88

 Yeravda Jail 106, 147, 166, 171
Young India 59, 61-4, 66, 68, 92-3, 103, 163, 170, 228
 Yunus, Muhammad 200

